

[5th December 1952]

III.—CHANGE IN THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Before we pass on to the next item in the Agenda, I must tell the House that I have received a letter from the United Democratic Front. The letter states that ‘ the general body of the United Democratic Front Legislature Party has to-day resolved to authorize Mr. P. Ramamurthi to act as Leader of the Opposition in the Assembly in the place of Mr. T. Viswanatham, resigned from the United Democratic Front.’ I must tell the House that the power to determine the party which should form the official Opposition is in the hands of the Speaker. To say which gentleman is to be the Leader of the Opposition is also in the hands of the Speaker. By this letter, they have usurped this power of the Speaker. In England, the official Leader of the Opposition is statutorily recognized by the Act, known as the Ministers of the Crown Act passed in 1937. According to this Act, the Speaker is given power to say which party forms the official Opposition and which gentleman is to be the official Leader of the Opposition. In England he is given a salary. I am saying all these things only to show that they have, by this letter, usurped the power of the Chair. Anyhow, I shall give my consideration to the letter.

“ Now, let us pass on to the next item on the Agenda, viz., the Madras Motor Vehicles (Taxation of Passengers and Goods) Bill, 1952.”

IV.—GOVERNMENT BILL.

THE MADRAS MOTOR VEHICLES (TAXATION OF PASSENGERS AND GOODS) BILL, 1952.

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Before we pass on to the next item, I want to raise a point of order. Sir, you may remember, I raised a point of order on a previous occasion and you were pleased to say that if I put it in writing, you will consider it. I did it, Sir. The Bill as originally published was referred to a Select Committee which also made its report. The Chairman was authorized to sign the report on behalf of the members of the Select Committee. The Legislative Assembly appointed the Select Committee and it is the duty of the Chairman of the Select Committee to report to this House and place the Committee's report before the House. But, we find that the Committee's report was simply placed on the table of the House just as any other paper. Sir, I think this is a point of order on which you must give your ruling. Anyhow, the Chairman ought to have reported to this House. If, however, the Government are not prepared to accept the Bill, as amended by the Select Committee, then it is their sweet will and pleasure to withdraw the Bill and introduce a new Bill. I want your ruling on the matter, Sir.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The Leader of the Opposition wrote a letter to me and I was also thinking of writing to him. But later, I thought that it was better to give a ruling in the House so that all hon. Members may know what the matter is. What the

5th December 1952] [Mr. Speaker]

hon. Member is referred to was in the old rule according to which the report of the Select Committee must be presented to the House. That rule says, 'The report of the Select Committee on a Bill shall be presented to the Council by the member in charge of the Bill . . .'. That is the old rule. But it has now been changed. In the Centre, that is Delhi, they have got a similar rule which says that 'the report of the Select Committee on a Bill together with the minutes of dissent, if any, shall be presented to the House . . .'. Mr. Viswanatham must know that the rule has been changed and according to the existing rule, it is enough if the report is placed on the table of the House. Probably the hon. Member has forgotten it. If there is any provision for presentation of the report, let him point it out."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"But there is nothing in the rule to the effect that they need not present the report to the House."

MR. SPEAKER:—"That was in the old rule, but we have changed it. The hon. Member may have a copy of it in his house. Let him go through it and compare it with the existing rule. Then he will agree with me."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Sir, there may be two reasons for the change. It might have been considered as unnecessary or the rule-changing authority might have specifically thought that it should not be there. On that account, we cannot take it as an implied provision that the report need not be presented before the House. Even the existing rule 91 (1) says 'The Select Committee to which a Bill has been referred shall make a report thereon.' Again, rule 92 says, 'The report, the minutes of the proceedings of the Committee as approved by the person presiding and, if the Bill has been amended, the Bill as amended by the Committee, shall be printed and copies furnished to each member of the Assembly.' So, it is not stated that the report need not be presented to the House."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The position as explained by the hon. Member is correct according to the old rules. But it has been changed now. The hon. Member, as one of the members of the Rules Committee, must know of the changed rule. Further, he did not object to the change then."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Even according to the existing rule, they have to print the Bill as amended by the Select Committee and supply copies to hon. Members. So it is implied that they must report to the House and present the Committee's report."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I may inform the hon. Member, the report has already been placed on the table of the House and this fact has already been mentioned in the Agenda papers. If, however, the hon. Member wants that we should revert to the old

[Mr. Speaker]

[5th December 1952]

rules, let him bring this matter before the Rules Committee. Let that Committee take up this matter and if it decides that we must have the old rules, I have no objection."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" If that is your ruling, I have nothing to say."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Sir, I raise on another point of order. The point of order that I raise is of a constitutional character. This House has got powers and jurisdiction to pass only certain Bills. With regard to Money Bills, the scope and power of legislation of this House is restricted. The powers of the State Governments to pass taxation measures are given in the Constitution under Seventh Schedule under List II, item 56, viz., ' Taxes on goods and passengers carried by road or on inland waterways '. It is not enough if we say that the measure is one of taxation of passengers and goods carried by motor vehicles. We must go deeper and see whether the contents of the Bill are such and whether it is actually a tax on passengers or something else. If in reality it is not a tax on passengers and goods and it is something else, then obviously this item 56 cannot cover this Bill. Now, here in order to see the crux of the matter, let us look into clause 3 of the Bill."

3-10
p.m.

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Sir, I want to suggest that proper procedure be adopted in raising points of order. Let the Motion of the Hon. the Minister for Transport be moved and my friend may then raise his point of order. Now nothing is before the House."

* THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" Sir, I beg to introduce the Madras Motor Vehicles (Taxation of Passengers and Goods) Bill, 1952, and move—

' That the Bill be taken into consideration at once.'

Hon. Members might remember that a couple of months ago, we brought in a Bill in this House by means of which we sought to levy a tax by way of a surcharge on fares paid for being carried in stage carriages in the City of Madras. Hon. Members might also remember that this Bill was referred to a Select Committee. In the Select Committee, the Chairman thought that the Committee had the right to change the scope of the Bill so as to change the surcharge on passenger fares into a tax on passenger fares. And discussion proceeded in the Select Committee with this fact in view. As hon. Members are aware, certain conclusions were arrived at in that Committee and those conclusions were presented before this House in the form of a Bill. But you, Sir, however, ruled that the Select Committee had not the right to change the very fundamental scope of the Bill inasmuch as the first Bill envisaged a surcharge on the passengers to be collected at the rate of one pie per mile per passenger and that the re-presented Bill was one that sought to levy a tax to be collected within the range of the existing rates. You suggested that the Government

5th December 1952] [Dr. U. Krishna Rao]

might re-introduce the Bill and proceed with that. In submission to your ruling, Sir, we have re-published the Bill and are now bringing forward the new measure, which in full embodies the recommendations of the Select Committee."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Sir, as I was telling you just a few minutes ago, it is not enough if the caption of the Bill is a copy of the title given in item 56 of the Seventh Schedule in the Constitution. One has got to go into the Bill itself and find out whether it actually carries out the purpose for which it is intended and whether, in fact, it is a taxation measure relating to passengers and goods or whether it is something else. If it is something else and yet the Bill is so called as it is, then it is a fraud on the Constitution. No doubt, clause 3 of the Bill says—

' From and after the commencement of this Act, there shall be levied and paid to the Government, a tax on all passengers, luggage and goods carried by stage carriages, and on all goods transported by public carrier vehicles, at the rate of one anna in the rupee on the fares and freights payable to the operators of such stage carriages and public carrier vehicles.'

The real question now is on whom the incidence of taxation falls. If we tax the passenger, the incidence of taxation, normally speaking, is on the passenger. If the taxation is on goods carried by vehicles, normally speaking, the incidence of taxation is on the owner of the goods who gets the services of the particular carriage for purposes of transporting his goods. That is the generally understood meaning of taxation of a particular thing. Now, if we go in detail into the Bill, we will find that actually—I am not saying that the passengers should not be taxed, far from it—on account of the positive opposition by Members of this House to a tax on passengers, the Government have now come forward with a Bill which they are not empowered to do. They miscall it a tax on passengers. That cannot be allowed to remain unchallenged. Clause 4 of the Bill points out—

' The prescribed officer may, on application by the operator, permit him in the circumstances and under the conditions specified in the schedule, to compound the tax assessable on him under this Act, by paying in lieu thereof, a fee fixed in the manner specified in the schedule.'

So, this clause makes it absolutely and abundantly clear that the tax is only on the operator. No doubt, the tax is calculated on the basis of the collections made by the operator, on account of the fact that he carries passengers in his vehicle. Therefore, the tax is actually on the operator.

" Again, let us take the penalty clause. It also shows that the taxation is not on the passenger. For example, if the passenger says that he will not pay the tax, obviously the penalty should be visited on him. But clause 9 says—

' Where the whole or any portion of the tax payable to the Government for any taxable vehicle in respect of any month in pursuance of sections 6, 7 and 8 has not been paid to them in time, the prescribed officer may, in his discretion, levy in addition to the tax so payable, a penalty not exceeding 25 per cent of the maximum tax which would have been payable to the Government if the vehicle had carried its full complement of passengers, luggage and goods or of goods only, as the case may be, during such month or portion thereof.'

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [5th December 1952]

Who is to pay the penalty? The operator has to pay it, because he owns that taxable vehicle. So, this Bill is a conglomeration of all sorts of things. Again, the Schedule to the Bill says—

‘The composition fee referred to in section 4 shall be calculated for the entire unexpired period of the currency of the permit or for a period of three months, whichever is less, at the rate in the case of a stage carriage, of eight annas per seat per year per mile, of the total daily mileage permitted.’

Here also the passenger is completely left out. The assessment is based on the total carriage capacity of the vehicle. This is something like a tax mentioned in the Motor Vehicles Taxation Act. It is a misnomer to call this a tax on passengers or goods. This is a serious question and I do not want any measure passed by this Assembly to be challenged in the High Court and declared *ultra vires*. Considering this position, I would like the Government to call in the Advocate-General and let us know what exactly his views are on the subject so that we may coolly and calmly consider this Bill. I would also request the Hon. Speaker to come to a decision on the point of order after hearing the Advocate-General and after a discussion thereon by the Members of this House.”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Sir, evidently there is a confusion in the mind of the hon. Member. We are not bound by what we call the Bill or what name is given to the Bill.”

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR :—“ I want to raise a point of order, not exactly similar to what Mr. Ramamurthi raised but something akin to it.”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Let the hon. Member raise his point of order after we have disposed of the one now before us.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ He says his is akin to the point of order raised by Mr. Ramamurthi. Let me hear him.”

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR :—“ It is only for the sake of convenience that I thought that I could raise the point of order now. My point is in reference to Article 246 of the Constitution. The distribution of legislative powers has been laid down in that article.

3-20
p.m.

“ Sir, Article 246 of the Constitution provides for three lists the Union List, the State List and then the Concurrent List. Now the Union List obviously is something where the exclusive domain is vested in the Parliament, and the State List, except in extraordinary circumstances, is something where the exclusive domain is vested in the State legislature and the Concurrent List is one where both the legislative bodies come to operate under certain circumstances. What we are concerned with now is to see whether this particular Bill would come within the scope of the State List or in the Union List or under the Concurrent List. If it comes under the Union List it is taboo

5th December 1952] [Sri V. R. Krishna Ayyar]

so far as this House is concerned. Even if it were to come under the Concurrent List, there would be obstacles and hurdles to be got over before passing this enactment. I submit that really speaking this particular Bill not only does not come within the State List but comes under the Union List. Therefore it is really taboo for this House to take it up.

“ Then, Sir, I invite attention to item 82 in the Seventh Schedule under the Union List, namely, ‘ Taxes on income other than agricultural income ’. I will come to this presently. But this is one thing that we must remember. This falls within the legislative powers of Parliament. In the same Schedule, in List II under item 56, comes ‘ Taxes on goods and passengers carried by road or on inland waterways.’ Along with item 56, item 57 may also be read with profit. Item 57 is: Taxes on vehicles, whether mechanically propelled or not, suitable for use on roads, including tramcars subject to the provisions of entry 35 of List III. Item 58 deals with taxes on animals and boats. The tax on the two modes of carriage by road and waterways is provided under items 57 and 58 and item 56 deals with taxes on goods and passengers. Then we have List III, item 35 regarding mechanically propelled vehicles including the principles on which taxes on such vehicles are to be levied. If it is a tax on motor vehicles, the principle on which the tax is to be levied has been included in the Concurrent List. That is to say, it has to be the subject of legislation by Parliament or if there is an existing law, it cannot be done without the consent of the President. Any Bill passed by the State has to be reserved for the consent of the President. In this connexion I invite your attention to Article 254 of the Constitution.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“ All this is admitted, Sir. I would like my young Friends not to be unnecessarily spending time over this. There is one list exclusively laying down that Parliament shall legislate on such and such matters. There is another list laying down that only States can exclusively legislate on those subjects. There is also the third list which says, either Parliament or the State may legislate. But the effectiveness of them would depend on the interpretation of the provisions. Mr. Ramamurthi’s interpretation is ‘ that this thing comes under the concurrent list. It does not fall within the exclusive jurisdiction of the State ’. Mr. Krishna Ayyar explains that it explicitly falls under the Concurrent List. Now what then? It is admitted, it falls under the Concurrent List. Never mind the exclusive list. The Government take the privilege of moving the motion that a law should be passed. The Government will take the consequences of it by approaching the President and getting his consent. There is no reason whatsoever for spending time on points of order now.”

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR:—“ Sir, my point is that it does not come under the Concurrent List. Probably because I was in the middle of my argument, the Hon. the Chief Minister

[Sri V. R. Krishna Ayyar] [5th December 1952]

has not understood my point. My point is that it does not come within the State List. It does not also fall under the Concurrent List. It falls under the Union List."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Let the hon. Member be brief."

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR:—"I am trying to mention here a particular aspect, a new aspect introduced in the Bill. What we find in the Bill as presented now, not as originally presented, is that—apart from the method of computation of the tax, how to reckon it, how to ascertain the tax that has been laid down in a particular manner with reference to the passengers carried and with reference to the freights paid, at a particular rate and all that—it is not at all a tax on freights and fares. It is really a case where the whole tax is levied on the gross income made by the operators. It is a tax on the owners and the operators. Therefore this is *ultra vires* of the Constitution. Not only is this *ultra vires*, it is a trespass on the legislative domain of Parliament."

MR. SPEAKER:—"After the Hon. the Leader of the House has spoken I will give my ruling."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"As a matter of fact, Sir, some arguments were advanced by the hon. Member Mr. Krishna Ayyar in answer to the hon. Member Sri Ramamurthi's contention, the one cutting the other. The point is this. Leave alone the name of the Bill. Here is some provision made to collect some tax on a certain basis. We call it tax on passengers and goods. If it is not so, it may be a tax on motor vehicles at the most and nothing else. The arguments advanced are simply this: because it is based on the collections made it is not a tax on fares and freights, it is a tax on the income of the operator and therefore a tax on the operator. Whoever it is, whether it is the operator or the passengers, somebody pays. It is not the person who pays to whom we have to look for the purposes of finding out the nature of the tax. Under the second list, item 56 deals with taxes on goods and passengers carried by road or on inland waterways. Item 57 deals with taxes on vehicles, whether mechanically propelled or not, suitable for use on roads, including tramcars subject to the provisions of entry 35 of the List III. The only thing is, it should be subject to item 35 under the Concurrent List. The provision we are making in this Bill is in no way inconsistent with the legislative powers of the Union Parliament. If it did, only to that extent it will be invalid. But we have examined the provisions of the Constitution. There is nothing inconsistent in the Bill."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Sir, the Hon. Minister was not sure whether the tax came under item 56 or 37. He said it came either under 56 or 57. That was his argument. I submit, Sir, it cannot come under either of these items because if it is a taxation on motor vehicles the Government can tax only on the basis of the total horse-power, or weight of the vehicle or on the

5th December 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

basis of the seating capacity. If that is done I can understand it. But the tax proposed is nothing of that type. It is really not a taxation of vehicles. The Government have themselves said that they did not want to tax the motor vehicles. They do not want to do it. But in this Bill they are doing it and making it appear as though they are not taxing the motor vehicles. My submission is that it does not fall under any of these items and therefore the State Legislature has not got powers to pass this Bill."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I have heard both sides. The hon. Member, Mr. Ramamurthi has raised only an academic question as to where the impact is and where the incidence of taxation falls. Now as far as the House is concerned, this comes under the State List, List II, items 56 and 57. It is perfectly *intra vires* of the Constitution."

SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, may I be allowed to raise a minor point of order with regard to the Rules of Procedure. The Hon. the Minister for Industries has introduced and moved 'that the Motor Vehicles (Taxation of Passengers and Goods) Bill, 1952, be taken into consideration at once.' I believe he has presented the report of the Select Committee as per sub-clause (1) (i) of rule 93 of the Rules of Procedure."

3-30
p.m.

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member has completely misunderstood the position. It is a fresh Bill and not the one as reported upon by the Select Committee."

SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN:—"What has happened to the Bill as reported upon by the Select Committee?"

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member Sri T. Viswanatham has explained it."

* THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I made it clear that this is a new Bill introduced by the Government and I answered that it embodies the suggestions made in the Select Committee. As to what exactly happened to the report of the Select Committee, you have come to the rescue and said that it has been placed before the House."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Let not the Hon. Minister say that I have come to the rescue. I gave my ruling on that."

* THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO:—"As I said, the features of this Bill are that it really imposes a tax on passengers at a particular rate; it also imposes a tax on goods at a particular rate and in the Bill provision is made for submission of returns, non-payment and penalties, recovery of tax, restrictions on the use of vehicles, appeal against demand, offences and penalties, composition of offences, power to make rules, and limitations for suits and prosecutions; it also gives exemption for passenger fares or freight for goods carried in vehicles which do not cover a specified mileage."

[Dr. U. Krishna Rao] [5th December 1952]

" Sir, I feel that I have got to meet some of the arguments advanced by the Members. My friends have told me that this is not an opportune time to introduce a new taxation measure and that the bus operator is already groaning under heavy taxes and that his income is not as much as it was a couple of years ago. I am not going to deny that fact. I shall take it for granted that that representation has got a genuine background. Sir, it has also been brought to the notice of the Government that routes parallel to the railway line or routes in areas which are suffering from famine are not very remunerative and that therefore, if this Bill were to be introduced, it will tell heavily on the bus operator and in some cases it may even force him to go out of the field. Sir, I was the other day listening to Sri Swayamprakasam giving us a tale of woe of what happened in Tanjore and I have been reading in the newspapers of what has been happening in the surrounding and neighbouring districts of Tiruchirappalli. And Members in this House have been for many months stressing the need for improving the conditions in the famine-affected districts mentioned by them or the necessity for providing more and more gruel centres or for repairing this tank or putting up that road or putting up another bridge. Well, if my friends are really sincere in all these attempts, they have got to provide the money for it and therefore I feel that I do not consider myself unfortunate to move a Bill of this type and I consider myself a privileged person to move a Bill which will distribute the burden of taxation on different sets of people. Sir, taxation in general must be on the landholder and must also be to a certain extent on the tenant, and must be on the professional man, on the incomes he earns and therefore I feel that it would not be wrong to make an appeal to the Members of this House and to the public outside to view this measure not as a measure of oppression, but as a measure of relief so that the Government may be enabled to get some money to do ameliorative and really constructive work outside in the country. I can assure that the Members of the Government are as anxious as anybody else in this House to avoid taxation. We are also aware of the fact that measures of taxation are never popular. But in view of the fact that this step has got to be taken to get money to run the Government and in view of the fact that district after district has reported drought and famine conditions and in view of the fact that huge sums of money are required to run this State as a Welfare State and as hon. Members are aware that the normal sources of revenue on which the Government of this land is dependent are fast dwindling is it not up to the Government to devise ways and measures of taking from the people some more money to be legitimately and well spent on them in return? Well, I quite agree that conditions are difficult. May I also put forward the view that if the public have to be benefited, such measures are inevitable and this measure is one such intended to cast a burden on a particular set of people, i.e., bus passengers, for solving the financial difficulties? Well, as I have said, there may be difference of opinion as to whether the quantum of taxation that is put is reasonable. That

5th December 1952] [Dr. U. Krishna Rao]

is a matter for discussion, arbitration and negotiation. But I hope that the Members will realize that some measure of taxation is necessary and if that is conceded, I think I have done my duty to impress the necessity for this taxation. Let us decide what exactly that amount should be later on?

“ Sir, I am only saying that the Government having themselves moved a fresh Bill quite different from what the original Bill was, want to impress that they realize the difficulty of those on whom this burden of taxation will fall. Therefore I said that it shall be open for discussion and negotiation. I therefore feel, Sir, that the Members must not grudge passing this little Bill. As I already said, the Bill does not tax very much the public, nor does it tax very much the bus operator. Sir, in the discussion on the Budget, if I may be permitted to say so, there was a general impression that the bus operator is one that can be taxed. I am not prepared to say that that is completely correct. Times have changed. I know that the bus operators are not as prosperous as they were a few years ago. We had looked into the balance sheets of many of the operators and I am fairly convinced that the margin of profit left over is not much. But let me make an appeal to them. Let them, even at the risk of a little loss, come to the rescue of the general humanity and let them not say, ‘our profits are no more’. Let them feel that they lose their profits on behalf of humanity. That is my only appeal to them. I therefore feel, Sir, that I shall be considering myself to be in a privileged position and I request my friends to cast this burden of taxation on one set of people who, I am sure, will ungrudgingly agree to pay this tax. Sir, I move that the Bill be taken into consideration at once.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Motion moved—

‘ That the Madras Motor Vehicles (Taxation of Passengers and Goods) Bill, 1952, be taken into consideration.’

3-40
p.m.

There are a number of amendments to this motion which have been given notice of. Mr. C. V. K. Rao, Mr. Ramaswami and Mr. Vinayakam have given amendments that it be taken six months afterwards, Mr. Venkateswarlu has given notice that the Bill be circulated for eliciting public opinion, and Mr. T. Viswanatham, Mr. Sri Krishna and others that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee. I want all these members to move their amendments. Let the amendments as well as the Government motion be before the House. I shall afterwards put the amendments first and then the main motion to the House. Mr. C. V. K. Rao will now move his amendment, and reserve his speech to a later occasion.”

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—“ Sir, I move—

‘ For the words “ at once ” occurring in the motion for consideration, substitute the words “ this day six months ”.’ ”

The amendment was duly seconded.

[5th December 1952]

SRI K. P. GOPALAN :—“ Sir, I move my amendment, which reads—

‘ That the Madras Motor Vehicles (Taxation of Passengers and Goods) Bill, 1952, be circulated for eliciting opinion thereon.’ ”

The amendment was duly seconded.

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ I move, Sir—

‘ That the bill be referred to a Select Committee.’ ”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ I second it.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The amendments moved are—

‘ (1) For the words “ at once ” occurring in the motion for consideration, *substitute* the words “ this day six months.”

(2) That the Madras Motor Vehicles (Taxation of Passengers and Goods) Bill, 1952, be circulated for eliciting opinion thereon.

(3) That the Bill be referred to a Select Committee.’

Both the amendments and the main motion are now before the House for consideration.”

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, the purport of my amendment is this: that I oppose this Bill. The Government have stated that they want more money and hence they are bringing forward this measure before the House. I do not think the Government are in any way justified in taxing the people more and more. This has been pointed out during the Budget Session by the Members in this House. The Government have already been provided with Rs. 62 crores for their expenditure. It is also the opinion of financial experts all over India that the Madras State is a heavily taxed State. As such, the Government are not justified in putting this further burden on the people. What is more, the Government have lost all sense of propriety in regard to this Bill; they brought forward a Bill some time back called the “ Madras Stage Carriages Surcharge Bill ”, and it was stated in the speech of the Hon. Finance Minister at the time when the House appointed a Select Committee that all details would be gone into. But although this House appointed the Select Committee, the Government made it a useless body and made that Committee accept a new proposal altogether,—viz., that which is contained in this Bill. The Select Committee report was circulated to the Members of this House, and the Minister, while moving this Bill, was about to say something about that; but he was corrected by the Finance Minister not to talk about that, and so the Minister for Transport simply stated that this is a new Bill which is being moved now before this House. Sir, whatever may be the name given to this Bill, whatever may be the object of this Bill, the object of the Government is to impose more taxation on the people. The reason for it is stated by the Government to be that they have got some welfare schemes to be financed by more taxation. I should like to know what these welfare schemes are. The Government have been in power now for the

5th December 1952] [Sri C. V. K. Rao]

last ten months. During this period, have they brought before this House one single welfare scheme in the form of a Bill? No, not at all. On the other hand, the proceedings of this House have shown that there have been a number of cases of starvation in the State, and a number of cases of unemployment have been brought to the notice of the House. Famine has been raging in the State. When such is the situation, have the Government come before this House with any scheme for providing employment for the people, or with any scheme for alleviating the sufferings of the famine-stricken people in the State? When the Government have not come forward with any scheme whatsoever, what right have they to tax the people more and more? Sir, it is a curious thing that the Government at one time say they are going to tax the operators, at another time they say they are going to tax the passengers; and again they say they are going to tax the goods, and finally perhaps everybody and everything. In one word, I may submit, this Government want to tax the small man. If only the Members of this House realise the real situation in the State, they cannot permit this Government to tax the people in this fashion. Already the Government have been given Rs. 62 crores, and they can easily find the ways and means for any further money by economising their expenditure. They are not trying to do that; they want to run the State machinery in the good old fashion, by paying heavy amounts to high officials and spending heavy amounts on repressive machinery such as the Police, etc. If the Government are really very sincere about the welfare of the people, their first duty is to economise; but they have no idea of economising. We cannot therefore permit this Government to tax the people more and more. I should like them to give us all the necessary data in regard to this Bill. How many buses are going to be taxed? How many passengers are to be taxed? What is the volume of the goods that are to be taxed? It has been stated that the old Bill as amended by the Select Committee would not give the Government sufficient revenue. According to that old Bill, the Government would get one-seventh of the estimated revenue from the buses, while as per the present Bill, it will be only one-sixteenth. Formerly, it was one pie per mile more, while now they are going to levy a uniform rate of one anna in the rupee. So, there is less money expected out of this surcharge on the bus, and that is why they want now to be compensated for this loss of possible revenue, by taxing the goods also. The Government have not supplied to the House sufficient information regarding the details. As I said, what is the actual amount that the Government are going to get out of this taxation? When last the Finance Minister spoke on the Budget, he said that the income from this source would be roughly Rs. 2 crores—if I am not mistaken. Now, according to this Bill, will the Government be getting that amount? That has not been made clear to us. But we know the Government are somehow trying to secure Rs. 2 crores. Sir, every year the Government want to fleece the people by adding to the number of taxes, and it is not at all justifiable that they should do so. Again, what are

[Sri C. V. K. Rao] [5th December 1952]

the number of vehicles that will be affected by this measure? I have with me some old figures, and if they are right, I think the number of stage carriages that will be affected is about 8,000 and the number of goods vehicles that will be affected is about 10,000. Altogether, several lakhs of people may have to pay the tax according to this measure.

3-50 p. . " So, Sir, the bus operator is going to be taxed; the passenger is going to be taxed and the consumer is going to be taxed, because the tax is going to be levied on the goods. Now, Sir, that is the proposal in this Bill with which this Government have come forward. It is not as if the operator is being taxed.

" Let us see how the operators are going to be taxed and whether they are in a condition to bear the burden. I am afraid the operators also are not in a position to bear this burden. Sometime back the Government came forward with a proposal to de-amalgamate the transport companies. By de-amalgamating transport, at the present stage we find that a number of small bus-owners have come into the field and under the present stringent economic conditions the buses could not run to their full complement. As such, the bus operators are not in a position to bear that burden. I do not mind if big fleet owners are made to pay the tax, but the Government are not going to tax those fleet owners, because they know pretty well they cannot face the displeasure of the big man. Therefore, they want to tax all small and sundry persons and say that it is the bus operator that is going to be taxed. My contention is that even the bus operator is not in a position to pay the tax. On that ground, therefore, I submit, this Bill must go, Sir.

" As regards the passengers, the present position is the passengers are only the common people. The standard of living of the people has fallen down much and the traffic is much less and therefore they are not in a position to be taxed at present. Therefore, for this reason, the Bill must go.

" Now, Sir, with regard to goods, the Government want to tax the consumer by levying the tax at one anna per rupee. Since the proposal is to tax the consumer at such a high rate, I submit that this Bill must go. I hope the members on the other side will realise the position that exists in the country. Especially when in the country there is starvation and unemployment at the present moment, we cannot allow this Government to tax the common man. Sir, we are supposed to economise unnecessary expenditure of the Government and we are supposed to bring forward welfare schemes. And as the Government boast themselves as a Welfare Government, the first and foremost duty of this Government is to come forward before this House with welfare schemes providing for security and proper living for the people. Then only the Government could come before this House for imposing taxes. Then the question as to who should be taxed must be considered at that stage. I do hope that the House will

5th December 1952] [Sri C. V. K. Rao]

consider seriously the nature of this Bill and come to the rescue of the common man who has elected us and see that this Bill is not imposed on the people. With these observations I close my speech."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I fix a time-limit of 15 minutes for each member."

* SRI K. V. RAMESAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, in supporting the amendment which has already been moved and is before the House, I submit that practically the operators of the various motor vehicles and carriers of goods are more or less heavily taxed already, if you take into consideration the existing taxes that are now collected on these vehicles. One important objection to the enforcement of this provision at this stage is that from the business point of view, if the operators were aware of the fact that there is going to be taxation on these vehicles in the beginning of the year, they would have considered the question as to whether there would be any advantage in operating the buses or the carriers. Therefore, they are now at a great disadvantage, because now they will be obliged to pay not only the tax that is now in force, but the tax that is going to be imposed hereafter under this measure. Therefore, I submit that under the circumstances it is a great disadvantage to the operators of motor vehicles and carriers to introduce this measure at this part of the year, particularly when already seven months have now elapsed and only five more months have to run. Therefore, the main object of the amendment is that this Bill should be dropped for the present and it can be taken up for consideration only six months hence. Another point of view is, it is admitted by the Hon. Minister, that there is a fall in the incomes of the bus operators and that the general public also are in great distress and it is not possible for them to bear the incidence of taxation under various heads. It is therefore desirable that this measure should be stayed from its operation for at least a period of 6 months, that is, the consideration of this Bill should be postponed for a period of 6 months.

" Sir, I have already submitted that the present rate of taxation per vehicle per passenger seat is Rs. 30. In the case of a pneumatic type vehicle with twenty-seater capacity, the tax is nearly Rs. 600 per quarter and for a year it comes to Rs. 2,400. That means, every operator of a vehicle is at present paying at the rate of Rs. 200 per vehicle for a twenty-seater bus. Therefore, I submit that this taxation is by itself sufficiently high for the operator of a bus to pay; and if he is made to pay again at the rate of one anna in the rupee, that would involve heavy commitments and also in a loss to the business. Therefore, I submit that in view of the present state of economic distress and in view of the fact there was no opportunity for the operators to consider the question at the commencement of the year, there is absolute need for dropping this Bill at the present stage and that it should be considered only six months hence."

[5th December 1952]

4 p.m.

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, while supporting the amendment that is before the House, I wish to point out only a few facts at this stage. In 1939 there were 3,000 buses and 400 busowners. To-day we have roughly about 9,000 buses and 1,900 busowners. Bus transport was a growing industry helped by war conditions. It is a fact that bus operators were making huge fortunes during the period of the war. But now, after the war, their condition has become pitiable. There is a lot of competition among them and not all routes are paying. Some bus routes run parallel to the railway line like the route from Madras to Chingleput. Even though they are allowed by law to charge 7 pies per mile, they cannot risk the experiment of collecting the maximum because the competition from railways is great. To attract passengers, they are now charging about 5 pies per mile. But transport trade is already paying a high tax. Annually the bus operators collect for the Government Rs. 25 lakhs, of which 12½ lakhs goes to the Government of Madras and the rest to the Government of India. We do not pay them anything for this good service they do. On the other hand, they keep the public moving and such a good public utility service must not be taxed heavily. Only recently the tax on buses has been raised from Rs. 17-8-0 per seat per quarter to Rs. 30 by the previous Ministry. To impose any further tax on the bus operators is tantamount to killing the goose that lays the golden eggs.

(Srimathi T. Kotamma Reddi occupied the Chair.)

“ Madam, I have more details in my possession. But at this stage I shall only point out to the Government that they cannot force the bus transport trade into slow liquidation, as the bus operators are already heavily taxed. Perhaps some of the Members of this House who are bus operators have, by their big limousine cars, high standard of living and extravagant expenditure evidently during the elections, created in the mind of the Government the wrong impression that here is a treasure which can be tapped easily. I may point out to you, Madam, the position from my personal experience with some of them. A bus operator who was owning about 30 buses during the war period and having a daily collection of Rs. 2,000 is now owning only about 15 buses and having a daily collection of Rs. 400. May be there is room for the suspicion that the bus operators sometimes maintain false accounts. But we cannot take the risk of levelling that charge against everybody. We sincerely feel that the present is not the opportune time to tax them. I would appeal to the Government to postpone this Bill for at least six months. I plead that in the meanwhile the Bill be referred to a committee, not a committee consisting of Members of this House alone, but a fact-finding committee which will go into the working of the trade, assess the real position and assist the Government with its findings. Then the Government can sponsor a fresh Bill backed more by the busowners themselves. Thank you, Madam.”

5th December 1952]

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“అధ్యక్షతీ, ఒక point of order పైన మాట్లాడుచున్నాను. ఒక బిల్లు చర్చకు వచ్చినప్పుడు, ఆ బిల్లును సెలెక్టు కమిటీకి పంపించవలసిందనిగాని లేక దానిపై ప్రజాభిప్రాయాన్ని రాబట్టవలసిందనిగాని సభ్యులు అంటున్నప్పుడు, ఆ బిల్లియొక్క క్లాజు వారి చర్చను ముందుగా తీసుకొంటారా, లేక సెలెక్టు కమిటీకి పంపించడమనే విషయాన్ని ముందుగా తీసుకొంటారా, లేక దానిపై ప్రజాభిప్రాయాన్ని రాబట్టి విషయాన్ని చర్చకు ముందుగా తీసుకొంటారా? ఈ మూడింటిలో ఏ చర్చను ముందుగా తీసుకొంటారు? న్యాయంగా దానిపై ప్రజాభిప్రాయాన్ని రాబట్టరెననే విషయాన్ని ముందుగా చర్చకు తీసుకొని, అది త్రోసివేయడము జరిగితే, దానిని సెలెక్టు కమిటీకి పంపించవలెననే విషయాన్ని చర్చించి, అదే గూడ త్రోసివేయబడడము జరిగితే, తరువాత ఆ బిల్లియొక్క క్లాజు వారి చర్చను తీసుకొనవలసియుంటుంది. అట్లుగాకుండా, ఇప్పుడు మొదటి క్లాజు మినహాయించి రెండవ క్లాజునుండి క్లాజు వారి చర్చ జరుగుచున్నది. ఇది out of order అని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. కనక దీనిపై మీ రూలింగు ఇవ్వాలని కోరుచున్నాను.”

CHAIRMAN (Srimathi T. Kotamma Reddi) :—“I will give the ruling afterwards.”

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—“I rise on a point of order, Madam. I do not know whether it is within the power of the Speaker to postpone the decision on a point of order when a Member raises it for immediate decision.”

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR :—“Madam, I join my Friends who have tabled amendments and oppose this Bill as uncalled for and as entirely inappropriate at this particular juncture. I seek to submit that the taxation proposals brought forward now under the guise of taxation of goods and passengers are really something different. But that is by the way. Even assuming that this Bill is *intra vires* of this Assembly, I submit that this is a Bill which ought not to receive the support of the House for the reasons which I am going to set out presently. It is common case that the taxation on motor vehicles in the Madras State is the highest. It has reached the ceiling limit and there is really no scope for increasing the tax at all. In fact, this is a point which will be readily conceded even by the Government. Government spokesmen have on former occasions said that they have no intention of increasing the motor vehicle tax because it has already reached dizzy heights. The traffic cannot bear any extra burden. We have got to find out what the repercussions of this tax will be and whether the Government will be able to achieve their object of augmenting the revenues of the State. I submit that the real effect of this tax will be to load the common man with some burden in addition to the burden he is already bearing. It has been made clear in clause 3 and it was mentioned in the Select Committee by the Hon. Sri Subramaniam that there is really no increase in the burden on the passenger. What really happens is this. The maximum fare prescribed under the Motor Vehicles Act is, I believe, 7 pies per mile. I understand that in many places—I

[Sri V. R. Krishna Ayyar]

[5th December 1952]

4-10
p.m.

am not speaking of Malabar and South Kanara—the fares collected are less than the prescribed maximum. The passing of this Act is a direct invitation to the motor vehicle owners to raise the fare to the maximum permissible limit. A passenger who has been paying $5\frac{1}{2}$ or 6 pies up till now will have to pay 7 pies. It is hardly a consolation that the increase is only one pie. Usually a journey covers not less than 15 miles and the cumulative burden is something which a common man's purse cannot bear. So much so, the contention that it really does not affect the pockets of the poor or the common passengers, does not hold good, because the Select Committee proceedings will bear out the fact that the only precaution is that the maximum rate notified under the Motor Vehicles Act should not be exceeded. On the other hand, a particular amendment suggesting that the existing fares and freights should not be increased was opposed by the Government. Therefore, this House can readily conclude that there is a very clear possibility, indeed a real probability, of the rates being raised to the maximum permissible limit, that is to say, immediately there will be an increase in the rate of fare payable by passengers.

As regards the freights collected by lorry-owners on goods transported, there is no restriction whatsoever. There is absolutely no provision in the Bill restricting the owner of the lorry from increasing the freights that he would collect on goods transported. The restraint is placed only upon the fares payable by bus passengers, obviously because there is really no provision under which the Government can fix the maximum freight to be levied on goods by lorry-owners. Thus, the result will be that, so far as passengers who travel in buses are concerned, there will be an increase in fares up to the maximum provided under the Motor Vehicles Act, namely, 7 pies per mile. As regards freights in respect of goods transported by lorries, they will readily be increased, probably to cover the entire surcharge which may be collected from the lorry-owners. So, the common man will be entirely helpless and, notwithstanding the assurance given in portions of the Bill, in pattern and in effect, it is surely going to affect sorely the poor man. I need hardly say that in this vast country where we do not have railway traffic all over, one has to depend upon bus traffic and also upon lorries. Lorries and buses are really the only vehicles by which the goods could be conveyed by the average middle-class man, and also wherein the middle-class men and the poorer classes could travel. So, if the rates of fares and freights go up, the real classes of persons who will have to bear the incidence of the tax, will be the poorer classes and the lower middle classes. It is highly improper. The country is so vast and the only common means of communication is buses and lorries and even they are partly inadequate. So, the entire set of hon. Members of this House will agree that to-day communications are the major problem for the State. We are an agricultural community; we have got to transport our goods to the markets and passengers have to travel and there is really no alternative means of conveyance except buses and lorries. If more taxes are levied on these vehicles

5th December 1952] [Sri V. R. Krishna Ayyar]

and if there is no protection against transference of these taxes to the passengers and to the owners of goods who want to convey their goods by lorries, the result would be that they will have to bear the burden of this taxation. So, the upshot of all these things is that the protection, seemingly given to the common man against these taxes being levied directly on him, is altogether illusory. The House will remember that when the original Bill was presented to this House, it was a direct tax on the fares payable by passengers. The people could see with eyes open that it was a tax upon the poor men and middle-class men. But probably there was such a volume of public opinion against it and such opposition to it inside this House that the Government thought it fit to drop the proposal. But, as a side-wind as it were, the same tax comes up in a new form. Immediately there will be an increase in fares from 6 pies to 7 pies per mile. Certainly, there will be a limitless increase so far as freights are concerned.

"One other point is this. Even from the point of view of the lorry-owners, described in the Bill as operators, as the hon. Member Sri Vinayakam said, it is really killing the goose that lays the golden eggs. The times supposed to be very prosperous for bus operators are gone more or less, because a general depression has set in all over the country and people are cautious not to waste their money, if possible, in unnecessary travels. People are very very careful not to travel or transport goods, if they could avoid it. That being the case, the boom that once attended this industry has already disappeared and to-day one can easily find that the number of applications for route permits for buses has dwindled to such an extent that the old gate crashing at the offices of the R.T.Os. and R.T.As. has disappeared. I know that several Bus-owners' Associations have protested against this particular measure as something which they will not be able to bear under the present circumstances. The cost of running is very high; the cost of fuel, thanks to the additional tax levied by the Madras Government, is fairly high. Not merely that, the cost of spare parts is very heavy. Above all, one can easily understand that, notwithstanding all these taxes—I can speak from personal experience so far as Malabar and South Kanara are concerned—the condition of roads is most deplorable. One can hardly be surprised if one is told that after every two days, the bus-owner has to change the springs which are fairly costly. Our roads are very very bad and, therefore, the cost of replacement will be high. On the whole, this business is turning out to be an uneconomic one and the present policy of the Government, which is fairly right, that big fleet-owners should not be encouraged but that small owners, having two or three buses, should be encouraged, also makes it rather difficult for these small bus-owners to bear the extra burden that is now cast upon them by this measure. On the whole, I submit that first of all, this is a tax which will really affect the pockets of the poor and secondly, this is a tax which cannot be borne by the operators under present conditions. Further, even after the imposition of all these taxes, the yield may not be as much

[Sri V. R. Krishna Ayyar] [5th December 1952]

as is anticipated by the Hon. the Finance Minister. So, let us not do something which will not achieve our objective but will only help to burden the people with more taxation and also handicap the operators unduly.

"On a general consideration of the principles of this Bill, I submit it should not be passed by the House. Entering into details is a different matter wherein perhaps serious alterations may be necessary, especially because I can straightway say that in Malabar and South Kanara where conditions are altogether different and where wear and tear in the case of buses is heavy because of the bad condition of the roads, heavy rainfall and hilly terrain, the cost of upkeep of buses is very heavy. There may even be a special case for giving exemption so far as the people engaged in the bus industry in Malabar and South Kanara are concerned. But all these are matters of detail which will arise later on. Considering the general principles of this Bill, I suggest that this House should oppose it and should not give its assent to it."

* SRI K. P. GOPALAN :—"Madam, Chairman, I have moved an amendment in order to oppose this Bill brought forward by the Government. This Bill is unnecessary and unwanted. When the Budget was being considered, there was a deficit. After that, the Government have raised a loan and that would have covered the deficit. Moreover, when I looked into the Report of the Department in charge of collecting sales tax, I found that about Rs. 2 crores were still remaining as arrears. I have seen a report to this effect in the newspapers. So, if the Government have got an efficient machinery to collect sales tax, surely they will get about Rs. 2 crores very soon.

4-20
p.m. "Regarding this particular taxation, the Hon. the Minister for Labour and Industries said that the Government wanted money. I want to ask him most respectfully, if they want money, why they should not cut down the huge expenditure they are incurring on the Police Department. Why are the Government not prepared to withdraw the compensation which they intend to pay to the zamindars of this State? Why are they not prepared to confiscate the British capital in our country? Why are they not prepared to cut down the huge amount of money which is going to England as pension for the British people? Without taking all these things into consideration, they come forward and say that they want money. So, I can put forth some proposals before the Hon. Minister as to how they can get the money required without resorting to this taxation. Now as far as I understand there are three Bills pending before the Central Government as a result of the recommendations of the Motor Vehicles Taxation Enquiry Committee. One Bill is the Motor Vehicles (Amendment) Bill, the second is the Motor Vehicles (Principle of Taxation) Bill and the third one is the Distribution of Motor Vehicles Taxation Proceeds Bill. If these three Bills are finalised the State Government will get seven annas per gallon of petrol consumed instead of the two

5th December 1952] [Sri K. P. Gopalan]

and a half annas that they are now getting. Moreover, the Government of India also propose to give something more from out of the import duty on motor vehicles parts. The Central Government are going to finalize these three Bills. Then the State Government will get about Rs. 3 crores, which they can utilize for any purpose they want. Moreover at a meeting of the Central Transport Advisory Council, held in Delhi sometime in April 1951, the Madras Government gave an assurance that no further taxes will be imposed on the motor vehicles in this State. Everybody knows that at the present time the tax on motor vehicles in this State is the highest in the whole country. I would earnestly and respectfully submit that the Madras Government are going to get about Rs. 3 crores on account of the three Bills that the Government of India intend bringing forward.

" There is another source of income which the Government can utilize without bringing forward this taxation measure. If the lorries are allowed to carry 8 tons of load instead of 6 tons, an additional sum of about Rs. 10 lakhs could be collected by the Government by way of taxation. Again, if the tax-collecting machinery is able to get all the money from the motor vehicles and lorries in this State, the Government can get some more money.

" Sir, about 2,000 buses are being used at present as spare buses without paying any tax, with the favour of the District Superintendent of Police and other Police officers. Some lorries are also used as spare lorries without paying any tax, with the favour of the police officials. Moreover, in most of the towns so many taxies are being run without paying any tax through the favour of the officers of the Police department. This is a fact and nobody can deny this fact. If the Government are able to collect taxes from all these people, then they will get about Rs. 70 lakhs.

" In this House, so many questions have been asked with regard to the grant of permits for running buses in certain routes in very many places. We have been told that many people applied for such permission and only got a refusal from the Government. If the Government give permission for all these people to run buses in those routes, they will get more money. If the Government only take into account all the proposals that I have just now put forth, they will get a good amount of money with the existing machinery and without bringing this measure of taxation before this House.

" I have heard people saying so many things about the Congress Government that is in office here at present. Some people tell us that Sri Rajagopalachari's Government is different from other Governments. I want to respectfully ask, ' what is the difference between the former Governments and the present Government? ' This Government has now come forward with this measure to tax the poor people. Who are the people travelling in buses? It is only the poor and middle-class people and merchants. Regarding the lorries, if the lorries are taxed, the consumers will greatly

[Sri K. P. Gopalan] [5th December 1952]

suffer. So far as taxation on the people is concerned, this Government is not different from the other Governments.

“As a result of the policy pursued by the Congress party—both at the Centre and the States—the industrial concerns of this country are being ruined every day, whereas the British concerns are thriving day by day. All our small industries are being ruined on account of the policy of the Government. I want to stress this point clearly and perfectly in this House. If the Government is to insist on this taxation measure, then it will go against the poor and middle-class people of this State. It will also go against the small bus-owners of the State and will ruin them. This Government claims that it is encouraging national industries. In fact it is not so. I am not supporting the big bus-owners and monopolists. They get more profit and they can give more money to the Government. Those people must be made to give more wages and bonus to the workers. But the present taxation measure will only hit the poor people and the small bus-owners. I would respectfully submit one thing to the Hon. Labour Minister. If only the Government are bold enough to take away all the British capital in this country, if only they are bold enough to stop paying compensation to the zamindars, if only they stop sending money to England by way of pension to retired civilians and if only they are willing to cut down their expenditure under the head ‘Police’, they will get a lot of money and there will be no need whatsoever to embark upon this taxation measure. If they refuse to do all these things, then I cannot understand their logic. This taxation measure is a dangerous one and everyone will have to oppose this measure. So I request the Hon. Labour Minister to withdraw this Bill. If however, he feels that this measure is necessary, then I would most respectfully appeal to him to circulate this Bill for eliciting public opinion. Then, the Government will really know what the people of this State have got to say with regard to this Bill. With these few words, I conclude my speech, Sir.”

* SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM :—“கனம் சபைத் தலைவி அவர்களே, இந்த வரியை நான் எதிர்க்கிறேன். அதற்காகத்தான் இந்தத் திருத்தத்தை நான் கொடுத்திருக்கிறேன். இந்த வரியை எதிர்ப்புகள் மூலம் நான் ஏதோ பஸ் முதலாளிகளிடத்திலே அனுதாபம் காட்டுகிறேன் என்று அர்த்தம் இல்லை. பஸ் முதலாளிகள், அவர்கள் காங்கிரஸ்காரர்களாக இருந்தாலும் சரி, காங்கிரஸை எதிர்ப்பவர்களாக இருந்தாலும் சரி, அனுதாபத்திற்குரிய முறையில் அவர்கள் நடந்துகொள்ளவில்லை யென்பதுதான் என்னுடைய அபிப்பிராயம். அவர்கள் வெறுக்கத்தக்க முறையில் லாபம் அடித்திருக்கிறார்கள் என்பதும் உண்மை. இப்பொழுதும் கூட, பஸ் முதலாளிகளுடைய செயல்கள் வெறுக்கத்தக்கதாகத்தான் நெம்பாலும் இருக்கின்றன. ஆனால், அதற்கு அரசாங்கத்தினுடைய கொள்கையும், ரோட்டாரைக் கோர்ட் ஸென்ட்ரல் ரோட்டாரைக் போர்ட் முதலானவர்கள் அனுஷ்டிக்கும் கொள்கையும் தான் காரணம் என்பது என்னுடைய அபிப்பிராயம். அதனாலே பஸ் முதலாளிகளை மட்டும் குற்றங்குறை கூறுவதில் அர்த்தமில்லை.

“இது பஸ் முதலாளிகளை பாதிக்கிறதா இல்லையா என்பது ஒருபுறமிருக்க இது பஸ் போக்குவரத்தையே பாதிக்கும். நமது ராஜ்யத்தில் இருக்கக் கூடிய போக்குவரத்தையே பெரிதும் பாதிக்கும் என்பது என்னுடைய

5th December 1952] [Sri M. Kalyanasundaram]

அபிப்பிராயம். இந்த விஷயத்தை நம்முடைய தொழில் மந்திரி அவர்கள் கூர்ந்து கவனிக்கவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகின்றேன். நமது ராஜ்யத்திலே ரயில்வே போக்குவரத்தே போதாது. வாகன வசதி போதவில்லை யென்று சொல்லி வியாபாரிகளும் சரி, சுருட்டு, பீடி போன்ற பொருள் களின் உற்பத்தியாளர்களும் சரி, விவசாயிகளும் சரி, குறைகூறிக் கொண் டிருக்கிறார்கள், கிளர்ச்சி செய்துகொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். இது நமது அரசாங்கத்திற்கும் மத்திய அரசாங்கத்திற்கும் தெரிந்த விஷயம். நம் தேசத்திலுள்ள ரயில் போக்குவரத்து குறைவு, ராணுவத் தேவையை மட்டும் உத்தேசித்துத்தான் ரெயில்வே நடைபெற்று வந்துள்ளது. இன்னும் அதில் எந்த விதமான மாறுதலும் ஏற்படவில்லை. தென்னாட்டில் ரயில் போக்குவரத்து மிகவும் குறைவு. 5,000 மைலுக்கு ரயில் போக்குவரத்து இருந்தும் கூட, 50 மைலுக்கு டீபின் லைன்கள் இருக்கின்றன. விஜயவாடாவிலிருந்து சென்னை வரையில் ஒரே லைன். இதனாலே ரயில் போக்குவரத்து எவ்வளவு பாதிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது? இதனால் வர்கள் நடமாட்டம் எவ்வளவு குறைவாக இருக்கிறது? இதனால் நம்முடைய வர்த்தகம் எவ்வளவு பாதிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது என்பதெல்லாம் தெரிந்த விஷயம். இதற்கு மேலே, இப்பொழுது நமக்கு ரயில்வே போக்குவரத்தக்கு உதவியாக இருக்கக்கூடிய பஸ் போக்குவரத்திற்கும் லாரி போக்குவரத்திற்கும் இத்தகைய வரி போடுவதினால் போக்குவரத்து சீர்குலையும். போக்குவரத்து சீர்குலைவதோடல் லாமல் வியாபாரமும், விவசாயமும், சீர்குலையுமென்பது என்னுடைய திடமான அபிப்பிராயம். ஆகையால் தான் இந்த வரியை நான் எதிர்க்கவேண்டிய நிர்ப்பந்தம் ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிறது.

“இன்னொரு விஷயம். இந்த வரி பஸ் முதலாளிகளைத்தானே பாதிக்கிறது என்று கேட்கலாம். அவர்கள் அமெரிக்கா கொள்ளை லாபத்திலே ஏதாவது ஒரு பங்கில் சர்க்கார் கை வைக்கிறதாக இருந்தால் அது ஆலோசிக்கவேண்டியது. இந்த வரியினுடைய நோக்கமென்ன? கனம் தொழில் மந்திரியவர்கள் இந்த துட்பம் தெரியாமல் இருக்கலாம். அவர் பொறுப்பெடுவான மனதுடையவர். பெரிய பஸ் முதலாளிகள் செய்யக்கூடிய சூதுவாதகளை இன்னும் புரிந்துகொள்ளவில்லையென்று நினைக்கிறேன். அவருடைய நோக்கத்தை நான் ஒன்றும் குறைகொல்ல விரும்பவில்லை. அவர்களுக்கு அனுசூல சத்துருவாக யாரோ சில பஸ் முதலாளிகள் இருக்கிறார்கள். அந்த பஸ் முதலாளிகள் இந்த வரி போடுவதற்கு யோசனை கூறியிருப்பார்கள். அவர்கள் இந்த வரியை வரவேற்பார்கள். அப்பேர்ப்பட்ட பஸ் முதலாளிகள் யாராயிருக்கும்? 80, 90, 100, 150 பஸ்களையோ, அனேகம் லாரிகளையோ வைத்துக்கொண்டிருக்கும் பெரும் முதலாளிகள் இந்த வரியை வரவேற்பார்களென்பதில் சந்தேகமே இல்லை.

4-30
p.m.

“இந்தப் பெரு முதலாளிகள் சின்ன பஸ் முதலாளிகளையும் சின்ன லாரி ஆபரேட்டர்களையும் சாப்பிட்டேண்டுமென்பது அவர்களுடைய எண்ணம். ஏற்கனவே பஸ் முதலாளிகளுக்கு நடைமுறைச் செலவுகள் அதிகமாக இருக்கின்றன. அந்த நடைமுறைச் செலவு அதிகமாக இருப்பதைச் சமாளிக்கக்கூடிய யார் என்றால் டி. வி. எஸ். போன்ற முதலாளிகள் சமாளிக்கக்கூடியவர்கள். அவர்களுக்கு spare parts இருக்குமதி செய்யக்கூடிய பலம் கையில் இருக்கிறது. டையர் போன்றவைகளை ‘வல்களைவ்’ செய்ய வசதிகள் அவர்களுடைய கையில் இருக்கின்றன. அவர்கள் ஒரு ஏக சக்ராதிபதியாக பஸ் தொழிலை கையில் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். அந்த முதலாளிகள் இந்த வரியை வரவேற்பார்கள். ஏனெனில், சின்ன பஸ் முதலாளிகளையும், சின்ன லாரி முதலாளிகளையும் களீகரம் செய்துவிட்டு ஏகபோகமாக பஸ் போக்குவரத்தை நடத்தலாமென்ற நோக்கத்தோடு சில பெரிய முதலாளிகள் மட்டும் இந்த வரியை ஆதரிப்பார்கள். அதனாலே இந்த வரியைப் போடுவார்களேயானால் பஸ் போக்குவரத்தும் லாரி போக்குவரத்தும் பாதிக்கப்படும். நம் பொருளாதாரம், வர்த்தகம், விவசாயம் பாதிக்கப்படும் என்பது என்னுடைய அபிப்பிராயம்.

(At this stage Hon. Speaker resumed the Chair.)

[Sri M. Kalyanasundaram]

[5th December 1952]

“அடுத்தபடியாக, பணம் வேண்டுமென்று கேட்டார்கள். பஞ்ச நிவாரணத்திற்குப் பணம் வேண்டும், நிர்மாண திட்டங்களுக்குப் பணம் வேண்டும் என்று கேட்டார்கள். ஆனால், இந்த வரி போடுவதற்குப் பதிலாக, சர்க்காருக்குப் பணம் தேவையாயிருந்தால், நான் ஒரு புது யோசனையைச் சொல்ல விரும்புகிறேன்.

“எனக்கு முன்னால் பேசிய எனது நண்பர் கோபாலன் அவர்கள் பணக் காரர்கள் மீது வரி விதிக்க சர்க்கார் தயங்குவதை எடுத்துரைத்தார். நான் சொல்வது என்னவென்றால், நம்முடைய ராஜ்யத்தில் 5,000 மைலுக்கு மேல் ரயில்வேயிருக்கிறது. ஆனால், நமது ராஜ்யத்தில் ரயில் போக்குவரத்தில் அபிவிருத்தி செய்யவேண்டுமென்று எந்த விதமான நன்மையும் மத்திய அரசாங்கத்தாரால் செய்யப்படவில்லை. இந்த 5,000 மைல் ரயில்வே விஸ்தரிப்பு முள்ள நிலைத்திருக்க, ஆதி காலத்தில் ஏதோ ஒரு தொகை கொடுப்பதாகச் சொல்லப்பட்டது. ஆனால், இப்பொழுது ஒன்றும் நமது ராஜ்யத்திற்கு வந்து சேரவில்லை. ரயில்வே வருமானத்தில் 163 கோடி ரூபாய்க்கு மேலே டிப்ரிவியேஷன் பண்டு, பெட்டமெண்ட் பண்டு என்றெல்லாம் வைத்திருக்கிறார்கள். அதிலிருந்து ஒரு 7 கோடி ரூபாயோ 10 கோடி ரூபாயோ நமது ராஜ்யத்திற்குக் கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று இந்த மந்திரி சபை ஒரு சிட்டம் கொண்டு வருமோமோ என்று கணம் இந்த விஷயத்தைக் கவனமாக முடியுமென்று குறிப்பாக கூறிக்கொள்ள விரும்புகிறேன். ரயில்வே வருமானத்திலிருந்து மாகாணத்திற்குக் கிடைப்பதற்கு உரிமை உண்டு. இந்த யோசனையை எதிர்க்கட்சியார் செல்லுகிறார்களென்பதைக் கவனிக்காமல் இதை ஆலோசனை செய்யவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக் கொள்கின்றேன்.

“இந்த வரி போடுவதினால் இன்னொரு ஆபத்தும் இருக்கிறது. பஸ் தொழிலாளிகள் சம்பந்தப்பட்டமட்டில், இது பஸ் தொழிலாளிகளைப் பாதிக்கும் என்பது என்னுடைய அபிப்பிராயம். சர்க்கார் கேட்கக்கூடிய இந்த வரியை பெரு முகலாளிகள் கொடுத்தவிட்டு, சின்ன முதலாளிகளைச் சாப்பிடலாம். அதற்கு மேலே பஸ் தொழிலாளிகளின் மீது அதிக வேலைப் பளுவைச் சமத்தலாம். இப்பொழுது பொருளாதார மந்தம் இருக்கிறது. பஸ் வருமானம் குறைந்துவருகிறது; ரூ. 100 வசூல் கிடைக்காவிருந்தால் இப்பொழுது 60 கூட வசூல் இல்லை; ஆகையால் 7 பேருக்கு 6 பேர் போதும். ஆகையால் ஒரு டிரைவரைக் குறைக்கிறேன்; கண்டக்டரைக் குறைக்கிறேன்; இன்னும் அவர்களுக்கு வேலை நேரத்தை ஜாஸ்தி செய்கிறோம் என்று சொல்லலாம். ஏற்கனவே சர்க்காரால் நியமிக்கப்பட்ட கமிட்டிகளும் அட்ஜாடிகேட்டர்களும் செய்த சிபார்சுகளைக் கூட பஸ் முதலாளிகள் நிறைவேற்றவில்லை, எமாற்றிக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். அப்படியிருக்கும் போது இந்த வரியைப் போடுவார்களானால் போலிச் சாசுகளைக் காட்டி, இருக்கின்ற பொருளாதார மந்தத்தைக் காட்டி, பஸ் தொழிலாளர்களைத் தொந்தரவுக்குள்ளாக்குவார்கள். ஆகையால், இந்த வரி போடுவதினால், கணம் மந்திரி அவர்கள் சொன்ன மாதிரி பஞ்ச நிவாரணம் போன்றவைகளுக்கு எந்த விதமான பிரபோஜனமும் ஏற்பாடும். அதற்குப் பதிலாக சீர்குலைவுக்குக் கொண்டு போய்விடுமென்பது என்னுடைய அபிப்பிராயம். ஆகையால், இந்த வரியை எதிர்க்கட்சியினர் என்னுடைய கடமையானதினால் இந்தத் திருத்தத்தை நான் பிரேரேபிக்கிறேன். அதை எல்லோரும் ஏற்றுக்கொள்ள வேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக் கொள்ளுகின்றேன்.”

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—“ಆಧ್ಯಕ್ಷ, ವಿ ಖಲ್ವನಾ ವರ್ಷಿಂಚೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ್ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂಡಲಾ ಆ ವಿಲ್ವನು ಪ್ರಜಾಧಿಪಾಯಾಂಕಿ ಪಂಪವರನೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರನು, ಕರುಕಾರ Select Committee ಿ ಪಂಪವರನೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರನು, ಈ ಸರ್ಕಾರನು ಕ್ರಿಸ್ತುಪೂರ್ವದಿನಾಂಕಿ ಆ ವಿಲ್ವನು ವಿಲ್ವನು ಪ್ರಜಾಧಿಪಾಯಾಂಕಿ ವರ್ಷಿಂಚು ಕ್ರಿಸ್ತುಪೂರ್ವದಿನಾಂಕಿ ಮಂಡಲೆ ಸ್ಥಾನಾಂಕಿ. ಕಾನಿ ಕುಂದುನೆ ಪ್ರಜಾಧಿಪಾಯಾಂಕಿ ವರ್ಷಿಂಕಿ ಕಾನಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರನಾಂಕಿ ಸ್ಥಾನಾಂಕಿ ಆನೆ ವಿಷಯಾಂಕಿ ಕರು ruling ನು ಕೊಡುನಾಂಕಿ.”

5th December 1952]

MR. SPEAKER:—“ I will get the point of order translated by the office and give my ruling later.”

* SRI B. SANKARAYYA :—“ అధ్యక్ష, జరుగుచున్న చర్చ సక్రమంగా ఉన్నదా లేదా అనే సందేహం వచ్చినప్పుడే point of order అనేది వస్తుంది. అటు వంటిప్పుడు ఆ point of order కు సమాధానమియ్యడానికి బదులు భాష తెలియ దనే కారణంతో ముందు అసలు విషయమై చర్చ సాగించి, ఆ తరువాత point of order ను translate చేయించుకొని ruling ఇస్తామనడం సక్రమమైన procedure అవుతుందా ? అందువల్ల మొదట point of order ను translate చేయించి దానిపైన తమ ruling ఇవ్వడం మంచిది కాదా ? ”

4-40
P.m.

MR. SPEAKER:—“ It will take time to translate it. So, I shall give my ruling later.”

* SRI T. ANANTHA PAI:—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, those who have been opposing this Bill have no objection to the Government collecting money by any predatory measures. But their objection is that it should not be raised in this particular manner. They have been telling the Government: ‘ If you want money, we have no objection; but you can have it either by taking away what the British might have left behind or what they are carrying on with: Or it might be by taxing somebody else except the bus-owners.’ I have heard, when the original suggestion came that it should be a surcharge on the passengers, a lot of sympathy was expressed for the travelling public, who might have been called upon to pay this additional tax. At that time, it was suggested in this House: ‘ Here are a set of people who are supposed to make a lot of money because they hold the monopoly of permits; there is so much competition for permits and why not you auction the routes?’ It was said that so long as it was not the passenger who was made to pay, it did not matter if we collected the tax from the bus-owners. The result of the suggestions in this House as well as in the Select Committee was that the passengers for whom a lot of sympathy was expressed were exempted for the time being from paying any surcharge and it was the bus-owners who were supposed to make lot of money that were called upon to pay this tax. Surprisingly enough, now, the sympathy has turned round to the bus-owners. Well, Sir, the time has come, I do not deny, when all of us in this House have to examine whether we can afford this costly administration and the burden of the existing taxes. I would have appreciated if a suggestion had come from the Opposition for bold measures being taken to restrict expenditure by the Government and effect economies in administration. The Opposition could suggest more positive measures than only cutting down the expenditure on Police, like adopting drastic measures of retrenchment, etc., in order that we might manage our affairs without resorting to any taxation. I think that would be most welcome to the Government and I suppose the Government also want only such concrete suggestions to be given to them. But to-day, as things stand, there is a deficit. The deficit has been there and the gap has widened on account of the fall in revenues from sales tax. We

[Sri T. Anantha Pai]

[5th December 1952]

have heard the other day the Hon. the Minister for Finance remark that the Government tried to accept some of the recommendations of the Ramalingam Chettiar Committee and effect a saving of one and a half crores of rupees, but that that amount was more than set off because of additional expenditure in other directions. If these recommendations were not implemented, to-day the gap would be larger by another one and a half crores of rupees. So, the time has come when we have to cry halt to this. But we could make concrete suggestions, bold suggestions and even unpleasant suggestions at the risk of becoming unpopular. We have to face facts. But what we see is no such suggestions are forthcoming. We do not mind so long as somebody else is taxed. But everybody is concerned only when it comes to his paying the tax. We find very good reasons to explain our difficulties. I do know that bus-owners are in difficult circumstances. But still the Government have brought in this measure. What is the consideration then? The consideration has been one of expediency, namely, the question of raising money. There does not seem to be any other alternative as things stand at present. By all means ask the Government to economise expenditure. The cry must come from all parts of the House and the public. Let the Opposition try to accommodate the Government to the extent expenditure can be cut down. But in the meanwhile, taxation measures have got to be brought in and I hope they will be only temporary. Let the Government be given time to look into the whole matter and see whether the bus-owners are really hit, and whether some relief cannot be given to the operators.

“ Meanwhile, Sir, when I look into the Bill, I feel that I have got to plead for South Kanara and Malabar in particular. I know that in any measure of taxation, exemption cannot be given to particular districts. But all the same, our difficulty is this. I will give one small example. To cover a distance of sixty miles from Mangalore to Coondapur, we have seven ferries and all the bus-owners are expected to maintain seven bus-services. The passengers get down seven times and get into the bus seven times in between. To cover these sixty miles, what sort of difficulties we have to experience and how much staff the bus-owners have to maintain! Besides, we want men to manage all these services, men to supervise the work. These are difficulties that South Kanara has experienced and is experiencing. Therefore, I would very much like that buses which cover the whole coastal belt should be given some consideration in the matter of exemption. We have exempted buses covering fifty miles a day. Nevertheless, I do not think this will help our operators. Something must be done for them.

“ Sir, we want money for financing the so-called welfare schemes which all of us demand and for which most of us do not mind if somebody else pays. So, under the circumstances, the Bill has to stand. But I hope, however, that it would be only a temporary measure because with the small exemptions now provided for, nobody can maintain buses. Fifty miles a day will

5th December 1952] [Sri T. Anantha Pai]

not be an economic proposition. I do not think even the town and city services do less than fifty miles. Small operators with one or two buses will not at all be benefited by the exemption limit proposed.

“ Then, Sir, no useful purpose can be served by referring the Bill to a Select Committee, for the simple reason that we have delayed this taxation measure and the State has lost a good lot of revenue from March up till now. It is no use prolonging this Bill any further because the next Budget is going to be before us very shortly. So, it is good that this House passes this measure with the minimum delay and there is no point at all in referring it to a Select Committee. I hope the Government will take into consideration all the recommendations made in the House for effecting cuts in expenditure and the Opposition, meanwhile, will support this measure so that our temporary difficulties may be got over and the measure also may remain a temporary measure.”

SRI S. VEMIAH :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, this Bill is a great burden on the common people. People are suffering a lot due to the adverse seasonal conditions. People in almost all districts are suffering and they cannot bear the burden of this additional taxation. This Bill hits the common people. The amenities provided for the passengers are very limited. I do not think that even the exemption given up to fifty miles will make us welcome the measure. I want to know from the Government how much money the Government hope to get from the passengers and how much money from the operators. I am sure the Government will change their present policy of taxing the poor people. They must think of other measures to raise money. They must take steps to see that those who evade paying sales and other taxes are made to pay the reasonable assessment they are subject to. Then, Sir, in several cases, though sales tax is collected from the people, the tax is held up in the hands of the merchants and other middlemen. And on some plea or other the income-tax assessee escape from paying the tax to the State. If these are collected for Government this fresh tax may not at all be necessary. Then, Sir, I submit that this Bill should be circulated for eliciting public opinion. The Government must get to know what the masses feel about the tax. Therefore my humble submission is that this Bill should not be passed without eliciting the public opinion. With these words I resume my seat.”

* SRI L. C. PAIS :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not propose to make a long speech. I do not also want to go into the various controversies raised on the other side. I wish to say only this much. Whatever the controversies or the arguments that might be raised on either side of the House this Bill is certainly going to become law. If at all therefore I speak, it is only with a view to convince the Government how necessary it is that a measure of this sort should not continue for one day longer than it is absolutely necessary. There is no doubt that the incidence of taxation especially of motor vehicles taxation in this State is

4-50
p.m.

[Sri L. C. Pais]

[5th December 1952]

very high. There is also no doubt that taxation measures, in whatever shape or form they might be brought forward are bound to work a real hardship upon the common man and our argument has always been that we are just the persons to help the common man and improve his living conditions. So far as this Bill is concerned, I may say it affects particularly one class of people, the travelling public. And among the travelling public, the majority is the middle class people. The middle class is said to be the backbone of the society and anything done to weaken them, weakens the society as a whole. This is one aspect of the question. We have next to remember that neither the bus-owners nor the lorry owners are doing too well. It might be said that so far as the persons who are long established in the field are concerned a measure of this kind might not affect them seriously. But so far as the new comers are concerned, it is not certainly so. I speak with particular reference to conditions prevailing in my district of South Kanara. The new-comers in my district are not doing too well. And the presence of the new-comer is absolutely necessary if monopolistic tendencies in motor transport are to be avoided. Having regard, therefore, to the fact that this Bill will adversely affect the interests of the travelling public and that it will have adverse effects on the new-comers, our only hope is that it will not be retained on the Statute Book a day more than is absolutely necessary; the moment the finances of the State improve, the Bill should be taken out of the Statute Book.

“ But, Sir, the question has been raised all over the country and I think it is a pertinent question: Are our finances ever going to improve when we have Prohibition? In the first place the large reserves which were bequeathed to us by the Advisers regime have practically disappeared. So far as the help from the Centre is concerned, it has not come in an ungrudging manner. So far as our revenues go, they show invariably a downward trend. Therefore the common man to-day rightly asks: Have you got the necessary finance to run your welfare schemes and your nation-building activities? A good slice of our income goes to the enforcement of the Prohibition scheme, not to speak of the crores that have already been sacrificed. The argument is very simple. The ordinary man in the street, the common man, believes in Prohibition also. He believes that it has done some good. He is also a believer in this that first things have to be taken up first, that essentials have to be tackled before non-essentials. The common man's fear is just this: ‘In your anxiety to persist in the scheme, in your eagerness to prove to the world that Prohibition is to some extent a success, you have thrown away precious money which should have been used to tackle the first things or the essentials of life. The suggestion of the common man therefore, is that the Prohibition scheme should be suitably amended or modified to suit the present conditions. The modification demanded is this: Popularise the use of ‘neera’ immediately. Put up the neera parlours for public auction. Throw them open to all. This will bring in substantial income. Watch how the scheme of ‘neera’ works. If it does

5th December 1952] [Sri L. C. Pais]

not result in abuse, and in my opinion it can never result in abuse, then as a second step free toddy from the purview of the Prohibition scheme. This will be a plentiful source of income. Toddy is an article of food. The labourers will like it and everybody will like it in the absence of stronger drinks. There is no reason why it should not be removed from the purview of the Prohibition scheme. Prohibition might of course be continued so far as strong drinks are concerned. With the income that is available it would be easy for the Government to run its various welfare schemes and other nation-building activities. If this is done, I am sure there will be plenty of co-operation from the public in the matter of enforcement of Prohibition to the extent it exists.

“ This legislation, as I said, has been primarily brought forward to fill up a gap in the finances of the Government. Such a legislation ought not to be allowed to remain on the Statute Book for a day longer than is necessary.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The hon. Member Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah raised a point of order, on which I shall give my ruling. It appears he raised a point of order saying that we are not following the proper procedure. Let me tell the hon. Member, he is new to the Legislature and let him not tell the House or the Speaker, the right procedure that we should follow. We are following the right procedure.”

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“ అధ్యక్షా, తమిళం నాకు పూర్వమైనటువంటి గౌరవం వుంది. నేను మీరు సూచించిన procedure మీద తప్పుపట్టడంలేదు. నాకు వచ్చిన సందేహమేమో మీరు తెలియజేసి మా అభిప్రాయాన్ని కోరాను. ఏలిల్లునుగురించి చర్చించవలసినప్పుడైనా మొట్టమొదట లిల్లును public opinionకుగాను పంపవలసినదనే సవరణను, తరువాత నెలుక్తు కమిటీకి refer చేయవలసిన సవరణను చర్చించవలసి ఉన్నది. ఈ సవరణలు ఏగిపోయి నట్లయితే తరువాత లిల్లును చాలాజావారిగా చర్చించవలసి ఉన్నదని నా అభిప్రాయం. దానిపైన తమ rulingను ఇవ్వవలసినదనే నేను కోరినాను. అంతేకాని మీరు యిచ్చిన అభిప్రాయాన్ని నేను ఎంతమాత్రం కాదనను. ఏ procedure సక్రమమైనటువంటిదో మీ వద్దనుంచి తెలుసుకోవలసినదే ఉద్దేశంకోసం నేను point of order raise చేశాను.”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ Sir, the hon. Member says that he never said that the procedure followed was wrong.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Then, is the translation wrong? Let the hon. Member continue.”

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“ అధ్యక్షా, నా కాగితం 51p.m. తాళు ఇతర materials నా స్థానం వద్ద ఉన్నాయి. కాబట్టి నేను నా chair వద్ద నుంచే ఉపసవ్యసింపటానికి అనుమతి ఇప్పించవలసినది కోరుచున్నాను.”

“ అధ్యక్షా, మోటారు షర్మిశను ప్రభుత్వం జాబీయం చేయవలసిన అవసరం ఎంతైనా ఉన్నది. ప్రభుత్వమే మోటారు రవాణా వ్యాపారాన్ని జరపడం బిక్క

[Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah] [5th December 1952]

మద్రాస్ ప్రభుత్వంలోనే జాతీయం చేయడంతో సంతృప్తిపడకూడదు. రాష్ట్ర వ్యాప్తంగా ఈ సిద్ధాంతాన్ని అమలుపరచి వ్యర్థలకుండా ఈ వ్యాపారం సాగకుండా చూడాలి. అలాగే ప్రభుత్వానికి తగినంత ఆదాయం వస్తుంది. ప్రజలకు కూడా ముఖ్య పుష్కలమును జాతీయం చేయడంవల్ల లాభం పొందుతారు. టాటారు పరిశ్రమను జాతీయంచేసే విషయంలోకూడా ప్రభుత్వం ఎంతో శ్రద్ధవహించవలసివుంది. ప్రజల ప్రయోజనాలకే పరిశ్రమలను జాతీయం చేయడంవల్ల వచ్చే లాభాలను వినియోగించవలసివుంది. అంతేకాని ప్రభుత్వ ప్రయోజనార్థమే ఈ పనుల్ని సాగవలసి వున్నాయి అని అవడం ఎంతమాత్రం సబబైనదికాదు. ప్రభుత్వ ప్రయోజనాలనిమిత్తం అన్ని పనులు జరిగవలసి ఉన్నట్లయితే అట్టి ప్రభుత్వం ఒక కార్పొరేట్ స్టేట్ గా మారి పోతుంది. ఏ పరిశ్రమనైనా జాతీయం చేసేపుడు తత్ఫలితంగా వచ్చే లాభాన్ని వినియోగదారులు అనుభవించినాడే ప్రజలకు జాతీయంచేయడం అనే విధానంలోని అత్యంతము తెలుస్తుంది. ఈనాడు మద్రాస్ నగరంలో బస్ రవాణావ్యాపారాన్ని ప్రభుత్వమే నిర్వహిస్తున్నదని విషయం ముందే చెప్పాను. విలే దీనివల్ల ప్రయాణీకులు సంతోషపడుతున్నారా? వారికి లాభం ఏమన్నా కల్గిందా అనే విషయాన్ని గుర్తించాలి. వాస్తవంగా ప్రయాణీకులెవరూ మోటారు రవాణావ్యాపారాన్ని ఈ నగరంలో జాతీయం చేయడంవల్ల లాభం పొందలేదని చెప్పాలి. ఈమధ్యన పుష్కల శాఖానుకూల ఒక ప్రశ్నకు సమాధానమిస్తూ మద్రాస్ నగరంలో బస్సులను ఉపయోగించే ప్రభుత్వానికి లాభమే వస్తోందని చెప్పారు. అయితే లాభం వస్తోంది గనుక ప్రయాణీకులు ఇచ్చే టికెట్ వెలులు తగ్గినారా అంటే అట్టి ఒక ప్రభుత్వవారి ఆలోచనలలో లేనట్లు చుంటారు శలవిచ్చారు. ఇదివరకు వ్యర్థలు బస్సులను సడివే ఉప్పుడు ఉండి బస్సు టిక్కెట్లకు ఈనాడున్న బస్ టిక్కెట్లు అధికమనే విషయం అందరూ తెలిసినట్టిదే. కాని ప్రయాణీకులు నాటిన్న నేడు హెచ్చుస్థానాలు అనుభవిస్తున్నారనేది సంకయాస్తద మన రికమం అందువలనే ప్రయాణీకులెవరూ మోటారు రవాణాను ప్రభుత్వం జాతీయం చేసిన ఫలితాలను అనుభవించలేకుండా వున్నారు ముఖ్యంగా ఈ రిల్లు బస్ యజమానులమీద పన్ను వేయటానికి ఉద్దేశ్యపడింది. ఈ రిల్లు యొక్క ఉద్దేశ్యంతో నేను వికీ ధివంపజాలవందుకు విచారిస్తున్నాను అయితే నేను పెద్ద పెద్ద వ్యాపారస్తులపై, బస్ కంపెనీ యజమానులపై పన్ను వేయవద్దనేవాడనుకాను. ఈ బస్ సడివేవారిలో ఆసక్తిమంది చిన్న యజమానులకూడా, 1, 2, 3, బస్సులు కలిగివారు నేకమంది, వారు ఇట్టివారిపై అదనపు పన్నులు వేసినట్లయితే వారు దానిని భరింపడం చాలా కష్టం. వారి వ్యాపారానికి ఈ అదనపు పన్నుల విశేష నష్టంకూడా వాటి నచ్చు నష్టం వస్తుంటే వివక్షి వ్యాపారం సాగించలేదు. అతడు అతనికున్న బస్సులను అమ్ముకొనవలసిన పరిస్థితు ఏర్పడుతాయి. అందువల్ల ఈ నాడు విస్తారంగా బస్సులు పెట్టుకొని రవాణా వ్యాపారాన్ని నిర్వహిస్తున్న పెద్ద వ్యాపారస్తులకే ఈ చిన్న యజమానులు తమ బస్సులను అమ్ముకొడికి విక్రయించవలసి వస్తుంది బస్ రవాణా వ్యాపారం కమిషన్ పెద్ద పెట్టుబడిదారుల హస్తగతమైపోయి ఒక్క గత వ్యాపారంగా తయారవుతుంది. Monopoly trade వల్ల సభరించే నష్టాలు ప్రభుత్వానికి తెలియజేయ నక్కరలేదు. గుత్త వ్యాపారమే స్థిరపడిపోయినట్లయితే ప్రయాణీకులు యజమానుల యొక్క దయాదాక్షిణ్యమీద ఆధారపడి ఉండవలసి పరిస్థితులు ఏర్పడుతాయి. ఉదాహరణకు కొన్ని విషయాలు ముందే చెప్తాను. ఈనాడు వన రాష్ట్ర నిగో బస్ వ్యాపారస్తులు ఎందరున్నారో, ఎవరెవరు ఎన్నెన్ని బస్సులు నడుపుతున్నారో అనే

5th December 1952] [Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah]

విషయమై ప్రభుత్వంవారు ప్రకటించిన నివేదికనుంచే కొన్ని విషయాలు చదివి విని పిస్తాను—

1 బస్ సడివేవారు	...	326 మంది
2 బస్సులు సడివేవారు	...	399 "
3 బస్సులు	..	417 "
5- 9 బస్సులు	...	125 "
10-14 బస్సులు	...	42 "
17-19 బస్సులు	..	36 "
20-24 బస్సులు	...	22 "
25-49 బస్సులు	...	34 "
50-74 బస్సులు	...	6 "
75- 9 బస్సులు	...	2 "
100-350 బస్సులు	...	1 డ.

“ఈ విధంగా బస్ వ్యాపారస్థులు మన రాష్ట్రంలో ఉన్నారు. ఈ బిల్లులో ఉద్దేశించునట్లు ఆందోళన ఒక రకమైన పన్నును కనుక విధించివట్టును. చిన్న యజమానులు కొద్ది కాలంలో ఆసలే లేకుండా పోతారు. వారి బస్సులన్నీ 30-40 బస్సులు పెట్టుకొని వ్యాపారం చేసే పెట్టుబడిదార్లు రకమేవోతాయి. అందువల్లనే ఈ నాడు చిన్న వ్యాపారస్థులైన అంటే 1, 2, 3, 4 బస్సులు మాత్రమే ఉన్నవారిని ఈ బిల్లుయొక్క నిబంధనలనుంచి మినహాయించబడినదని కోరుతున్నాము. అటువల్ల వ్యక్తులపరంగా మోటారు రవాణా వ్యాపారం నిర్వహించబడడమే తప్ప, దానికి తోడు ఏ పెద్ద వ్యాపారస్థుల చేతులలో మాత్రమే అవి ఇమిడి భుండ్లం మరి నష్టదాయకం. నిర్వహణ సంవత్సరం వరకు ఈ వ్యాపారాన్ని జాతీయం చేయవలసివుంది. ఒకవేళ ఆ విధంగా జాతీయం చేయడం సాగకపోయినట్లయితే బస్సులలో పనిచేసే కండక్టర్లు, డ్రైవర్లు సహకార సంఘాలకు దీనిని అప్పగించాలి. ప్రభుత్వమే కనుక సహకారి సంఘాలతో అనేకమంది డ్రైవర్లు, కండక్టర్లు సహకార సంఘాలుగా ఏర్పడి ఈ వ్యాపారాన్ని నిర్వహించగలరని రకంలో ఎంతమాత్రం సందేహంలేదు. కావలసినట్లైతే ప్రభుత్వంవారి ధృఢ సంకల్పమే. ఈ వ్యాపారాన్ని ప్రభుత్వంవారు జాతీయం చేయడం గాని లేదా బస్ కార్మికుల సహకార సంఘాలద్వారా నడిపించడంగాని చేయడం లేదు. ఫలితం ఏమిటి? నానాటికి బస్ వ్యాపారం పెట్టుబడిదారుల చేతులలో ఇమిడిపోతున్నది. ఈ బిల్లే కనుక వానైనట్లయితే అదొక గుత్త వ్యాపారంగా మరి పోతుందనడానికి ఎంతమాత్రం సందేహంలేదు. ఈ నాడే బస్ యజమానులు ఎంతో అన్యాయంగా ప్రవర్తిస్తున్నారు. బస్ స్టేషన్ వివరంగా పెంచివేస్తున్నారు. ఒక చోటనుంచి మరొక చోటికి జరుపవలసిన ప్రయాణపు దూరానికి అట్రాక్ ఆరమైలు ఇట్రాక్ ఆరమైలు చేర్చి ఎక్కువ దూరమున్నదని చెప్పి హెచ్చు రేట్లు వసూలు చేస్తున్నారు. ఉదాహరణకు తెనాలి-గుంటూరు మధ్యనడిచే బండ్ల విషయం చూడండి. గుంటూరు-తెనాలి మధ్యదూరం 16 మైళ్ళకు లావే వుంటుంది. అయితే ఈ నాడు 13 అణాలు వసూలు చేస్తున్నారు. ఇదేమి న్యాయమో చూడండి. ప్రభుత్వం ఉత్తర్యుల ప్రకారం వారు మైలుకు ఏడు వైసలు మించకుండా రేటు ఉండాలి. అయితే బస్ యజమానులు ఈ నియమాన్ని ఎంతమాత్రం పాటించడంలేదు. రేటును

[Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah] [5th December 1952]

కాలిక్యులేటు చేయటంలో పైసలు శేషం వచ్చినట్లయితే దానిని ఆటోక్రింద మార్చి వేస్తున్నారు. ఈనాడు ప్రయాణికులు ఎంతో హెచ్చురేట్లు ఇచ్చుకొనవలసివస్తున్నది. ఈ బిల్లు కనుక పానైనట్లయితే చిన్న వ్యాపారస్థులు రంగంలో లేకపోవుట వల్ల పెద్ద వ్యాపారస్థులు తమ యిష్టంవచ్చినట్లు రేట్లు వసూలు చేస్తారు. వారిని అడ్డగించే వారెవరూకూడా వుండరు. లంచగొండితనం విపరీతంగా పెరిగిపోతుంది. డిస్ట్రీక్టులు పెద్ద వ్యాపారస్థులను ఏమీ ఆనలేరు. ఇదివరలో ప్రజాప్రతినిధులు ఏమైనా ప్రభుత్వంవారితో పిర్యాదు చేస్తారేమో అనే భయం వుండేది. కాని ఈనాడు అటువంటిదేమీ లేదు. ప్రజా ప్రతినిధులు అధికారుల కార్యకలాపాలతో జోక్యం కలిగించుకోరాదన్నారు. వాగానేవుంది. అయితే అధికారులు తమ విధులను అతిక్రమించినట్లయితే చేయవలసిన పని ఏమిటి? పూర్వం ప్రజాప్రతినిధులు అధికారుల విధులలో జోక్యం కలుగజేసుకొని అధికారులను స్వప్రయోజనాలకొరకు ఉపయోగించుకొనేవారేమో. అట్టి జోక్యం ఈ నాడు ఉండకపోవడం హర్షింపవలసిన విషయమే. అయితే అధికారులను పూర్తిగా వారి ఇష్టానుసారం వదలివేయడం మాత్రం చాలా విపరీత పరిస్థితులకు దారి తీస్తుందని ముఖ్య మంత్రి గార్హి తెలియజేస్తున్నాను. ఆయన డిస్ట్రీక్టులపై నమ్మకముంచమని ఆవిశ్వాసంతగదని పలుమార్లు సలహాయస్తూవుంటారు. అయితే ఎట్టి డిస్ట్రీక్టులను వారు విశ్వసించమంటారు అని అడుగుతున్నాను. ఆవిశ్వాసనీయైనవారని వారు నమ్మమంటారా లేక విశ్వసనీయైనవారని వారు నమ్మమంటారా? వారి ప్రభుత్వంవచ్చిన తరువాత ఎడ్మినిస్ట్రేషన్ ఏదో కట్టుదిట్టంగా జరుపుతున్నామని వారు సంప్రదించడవచ్చు. ఇతరుల జోక్యాన్ని అరికట్టాంకదా అని ఆనందపడవచ్చు. అయితే జిల్లాలలో డిస్ట్రీక్టులకు ఎట్టిభయం లేక పోవడంవల్ల వారు తమ యిష్టంవచ్చినట్లు సంచరిస్తున్నారు. క్రింది డిస్ట్రీక్టులు ఏ తపై ఏనా చేసినట్లయితే పై డిస్ట్రీక్ట్ ఆతనిని బలపరుస్తున్నారేకాని న్యాయాన్వయ విచారణ చేయడంలేదు. దీనివల్ల అధికార దుర్వినియోగం జరిగి నిరంకుశాధికారం వెలాయించబడుతోంది. అనేకమంది డిస్ట్రీక్టులు వేలకువేల దొంతరలుకట్టుకుంటున్నారు. ఈ విధంగా నేనన్నానంటే అందరు డిస్ట్రీక్టులూ లంచగొండులనిమాత్రంకాదు. కొంతమంది మంచివారు ఉండవచ్చు. అట్టివారిని ఎవ్వరూ నిందించరు. కాని ఈనాడు మాటారు రవాణా వ్యాపారం ఎంతో అక్రమంగా వున్నది. ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగులు అన్యాయంగా హెచ్చురేట్లు వసూలుచేసే బస్ యజమానులను అదుపులో ఉంచలేకపోతున్నారు అనే విషయాలు గమనించాలి. ఈ విషయం అందరకు తెలిసినట్టిదే కాబట్టి ఈ బిల్లువల్ల పెట్టుబడిదారులు బస్ వ్యాపార రంగాన్ని పూర్తిగా అక్రమించుకొంటారని అందువల్ల సంభవించే దుష్ఫలితాలు అధికమని తెలియ చేస్తూ యాబిల్లును ప్రజాభిప్రాయాన్ని తెలుసుకొనే నిమిత్తం పంపడంకాని లేదా సెలెక్ట్ కమిటీకి refer చేయడంకాని, మంచిదని చెబుతున్నాను.”

5-10
p.m.

* SRI N. MAHALINGAM :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Bill with certain misgivings. It is the duty of the business community to be an agent of the Government to collect taxes from the public. But it is only with the co-operation of the public that the Government can get their taxes for running a Welfare State that we all wish for. But it is also the duty of the Government to see that a certain industry alone is not overtaxed. The main feature of the present Bill is that out of the collections one anna per rupee should be given to the Government as surcharge. The compounding rate that has been fixed is Rs. 12-8-0 per seat

5th December 1952] [Sri N. Mahalingam]

per quarter or eight annas per seat per mile per year. The present condition of transport in this State is not as it was sometime back. The transport industry was at its height during the period 1944 to 1946 as railway facilities were restricted and the number of buses also was restricted. After 1946, i.e., after the termination of the War, railway facilities have greatly increased and the number of buses also has greatly increased. Then, Sir, in 1948, the tax on motor vehicles was increased from Rs. 17 to Rs. 30 per seat per quarter. If we compare the cost of spare parts, tyres, tubes, etc., in 1946 with the existing prices, the increase is nearly 200 to 250 per cent on the average. The cost of operation in 1946-47 was between six and seven annas per mile and now it is between twelve to thirteen annas per mile. So when the Government want to impose additional taxation on the transport industry, they have to take care that the additional taxation will not be such as to kill the industry itself."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"What is the collection per mile?"

* SRI N. MAHALINGAM:—"The collection per mile depends upon the route and the rate that is charged. The rate that is now allowed is seven pies per mile and it was six pies in 1946 whereas in the rest of India it is up to nine pies. In some parts of the State, seven pies per mile is actually being collected. If there is a load factor of 75 per cent and the collection is seven pies per mile on a thirty-seater bus running 120 miles, the collection will be Rs. 98-7-0. If the rate is five pies per mile on a thirty-seater bus running 120 miles, the collection will be Rs. 72-5-0.

"Then, Sir, the number of lorries that were plying in 1946 was greater and now about 1,500 lorries have gone out. At present, the lorry traffic is very badly hit. I would even suggest that no fresh taxation need be imposed upon lorries as it will heavily affect the lorry transport and the number of lorries on the road will still go down. The proposed taxation is about 40 per cent over the existing tax. If only there is 75 per cent load factor throughout, it will be possible for the industry to pay the existing taxation and if only we get more load it will be possible to pay the proposed taxation. So, in any route where the load factor is less than 75 per cent, it will be impossible to bear any additional taxation and I fear many of the routes may go out of operation within the next year. I request the Government to take note of the number of buses that are at present operating and to see whether there will be any decrease in the successive quarters.

"Sir, the question of spare buses is not clear. In 1948 when the tax was increased from Rs. 17 to Rs. 30 per seat per quarter, an assurance was given that the spare buses will not be taxed. That assurance was not kept up. The spare buses also were finally taxed. Now there is nothing specific in the Bill in regard to spare buses. From a reading of the Bill, I find only the route buses are to be taxed; but it would be better if it is made specific that

[Sri N. Mahalingam] [5th December 1952]

only route buses are to be taxed. I may also say that, as the rate of collection per mile has been restricted to seven pies, the Bill itself is not necessary. The Government could have increased the tax per seat and the appointment of additional officers could have been easily avoided and all the complications of the transport operators submitting a number of returns to the wayside police stations could also have been easily avoided.

5-20
p.m.

"Sir, there is a general impression that the bus operator is making a huge profit and that he should be taxed. Well, that impression might have had some truth during the peak period of transport, i.e., from 1944 to 1946, when the number of buses was restricted and when there was more money with the people. In these days of successive droughts, I fear the transport industry is already paying a rather heavy amount of tax, and it will only be further burdening the industry if we increase the taxation at the present moment. I only request the Government to watch the industry carefully, how the previous taxation affected the industry and how the present taxation would affect it further. In case the number of vehicles on the road goes down, the Government should not stand on prestige to amend the Bill. In an industry such as the transport industry, for the purpose of investment, most of the operators are getting only credit. Under Clause 10 of the Bill, when there is default of the payment of tax, for the purposes of recovery, it has been stated that the vehicle can be seized and sold out. Sir, many of the operators who are running vehicles, mortgage their vehicles to the Banks and take loans on the security of the vehicles. If Governmental dues are to be recovered only by the sale of the vehicles, if that is the condition laid down, the credit facilities of the operators would be greatly curtailed. I wish to point out to the Government that this is an unnecessary clause. As it is, there is provision for collection of the tax just like land revenue, and that is quite sufficient.

"Finally, Sir, this transport industry is a small-scale industry and the capital invested in it is not a certain factor. It is not a big industry such as a bank or a limited company where the shares can be sold. Unless you get a profit in this transport industry, there is no chance of getting the money back, not even a portion of it by open market sale. At the present rate of interest, on an investment of Rs. 20,000, Rs. 2,400 will have to be paid as interest, at 12 per cent, and even if you want to make only six per cent profit on the capital, you will have to earn another Rs. 1,200. Most of the small bus-owners have purchased buses only on credit and it will not be possible for them to pay off the interest charges and at the same time earn much profit. So, I request the Government to watch carefully the effect of this Bill on the transport system as it exists to-day. Thank you, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER :—"I reduce the time-limit to ten minutes for each member."

5th December 1952]

* SRI C. PULLA REDDI :—“ అధ్యక్ష ! ప్రభుత్వంవారు తీసుకొనివచ్చిన ఈ బిల్లును నేను పూర్తిగా వ్యతిరేకిస్తున్నాను. మంత్రిగారు ఈ బిల్లును ప్రతిపాదిస్తూ అదనపు పన్నును బఫ్ యజమానులనుంచే వసూలుచేస్తామని చెప్పారు. ఇది ఎంత మాత్రం సరియైన ఉద్దేశ్యంకాదని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ఈ బిల్లువల్ల వసూలయ్యే మొత్తం యివ్వవలసివచ్చే ప్రయాణికులకాని బఫ్ యజమానులు ఎన్నడూకాదని సభ్యులు గమనించగోరాను. ఈ విషయం ప్రభుత్వంవారికి తెలియనటువంటిదికాదు. కాని ప్రజలను మధ్యతెట్టుటకే ఈ విధంగావారు చెప్పుతున్నారు. ఇదివరలో sales taxes విధించే సందర్భంలోకూడా రాజగోపాలాచార్యులుగారు ఇలాగే చెప్పుతూ వుండేవారు. కాని వాస్తవానికి వింజరుగుతోందో అందరూ తెలిసినట్టిదే. ఆనాడు అప్పుకపు పన్నును వర్తకులవద్దనుంచే వసూలు చేస్తాం అని చెప్పారు. కాని ఈనాడు అప్పుకపు పన్ను రూపేణా ప్రజలవద్దనుంచి ఏటా 14, 15 కోట్ల రూపాయలు వసూలు చేయబడుతున్నాయి. తప్పటితగా వస్తువుల ధరలు పెరిగిపోయి ప్రజాసామాన్యం ఎంతో బాధపడవలసివస్తున్నది. ముఖ్యంగా మోటారు రవాణా వ్యాపారం మన రాష్ట్రంలో ఈనాడు ఏస్థితిలో వున్నదో గమనించండి. ఇతర రాష్ట్రాలలో మోటార్ల మీద వసూలుచేసే పన్ను కన్న మన రాష్ట్రంలో వసూలు చేయబడే మొత్తం చాలా అధికంగావుంది. ఈ విషయం ప్రభుత్వానికి తెలియనట్టిదికాదు. 1949 వ సంవత్సరంలో 270 నుంచి 360 రూపాయలవరకూవుండే లారీ పన్ను ఈ నాడు 427 రూపాయలవరకు పెంచబడింది. అలాగే నీటుకు 17 రూపాయల చొప్పునవుండే బఫ్ పన్ను ఇప్పుడు 30 రూపాయలవరకు పెంచబడింది. దీనికితోడు ఈ బిల్లులో ఉద్దేశించినట్లు బఫ్ యజమానులు హెచ్చు పన్ను చెల్లించాలి అన్నట్లయితే ప్రయాణికులవద్దనుంచి అదనపు రేటు వసూలు చేయకుండా ఏ యజమాని చెల్లించలేదని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ఇది చాలా అక్రమమైన పన్ను. దీనివల్ల రైతులకు, సాధారణ ప్రయాణికులకు చాలా నష్టం సంభవిస్తుందని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. లారీ పన్ను పెంచడంవల్ల ముఖ్యంగా రైతులకు ఎంతనష్టం సంభవిస్తుందో మనవిచేస్తాను. ఈ నష్టం రాయలసీమ ప్రాంతాలలోని రైతులకు మరి హెచ్చుగా వున్నదని చెప్పవలసివున్నది. మా ప్రాంతంలో రైలు, రోడ్డు మార్గాలు చాలా తక్కువ. పండించిన వస్తువులు హెచ్చు భాగం దూర ప్రాంతాలలో వుండే వర్తక కేంద్రాలకు లారీలద్వారానే రవాణా కావలసివుంది. కర్షులు జిల్లాలోని నంద్యాల సెంటర్ కు 20 మైళ్ల దూరానవున్న వెలుగోడు గ్రామంనుంచి వెరుకెనగ తీసుకొని రావలసివుంది. ఇలాతీసుకొని వచ్చుటకు రైతులు మణుగుకు 5 అణాలు చెప్పించవలసివుంది. నంద్యాలలో మణుగు ధర 5-11-0 వున్నట్లయితే లారీ చార్జి పోను రైతుకు దక్కేది 5-6-0 మాత్రమే. ఈ విధంగా రైతుకు ఎంతో నష్టం సంభవిస్తోంది. ప్రభుత్వం యింకా మోటార్ పన్ను హెచ్చుచేసినట్లయితే రైతులు తమ ఆదాయంలో హెచ్చు భాగాన్ని రవాణా ఖర్చులుక్రింద చెప్పించవలసివస్తుంది. ఇదే విధంగా బఫ్ ప్రయాణికులకూడా బాధపడవలసివుంటుంది. ప్రయాణికులకు ఎట్టి సౌకర్యం కలుగజేయలేకపోతున్నాం సరికదా వారిమీద హెచ్చు పన్నులు రుద్దటం నాయ్యమా అని అడుగుతున్నాను. అవరణలో ఈ పన్ను ప్రయాణికులవద్దనుంచే వసూలు చేయబడుతుంది కాని బఫ్ యజమానులు వారి ఆదాయాలనుంచి దీనిని చెల్లించ రని మాత్రం మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. రాయలసీమవంటి పెనుకబడిన ప్రాంతాలలో ప్రయాణ సౌకర్యాలు నామమాత్రంగా వున్నాయి. అటువంటి ప్రాంతాలలో ఈ బిల్లువల్ల ఉన్న గొద్దిపాటి సౌకర్యంకూడా లేకుండాపోతుందేమోనని భయపడవలసివుంది. అనేక ప్రాంతాలలో బస్సులు నడుపబడటంలేదు. ప్రయాణ సౌకర్యాలు బొత్తిగా లేవు. అదనపు పన్ను ఇచ్చుకొనవలసివచ్చుటచేత ఎవ్వరూ ఆ ప్రాంతాలలో బస్సులు నడపరు.

[Sri C. Pulla Reddi] [5th December 1952]

అంతేకాకుండా బస్సునడిచే ప్రాంతాలలోకూడా రేట్లు వివరితంగా పెరిగిపోతాయి. అదనపు ఖర్చు వల్ల చిన్న వ్యాపారస్థులు ఏమి గిట్టుబాటులేని కారణంచేత తమ బస్సులను పెద్ద వ్యాపారస్థులకు విక్రయించుకొనవలసి వస్తుంది. ఇకొక గుర్త వ్యాపారంగా ఖరీదైన మిస్తుంది. ఈ విషయాన్ని ప్రభుత్వంవారు గుర్తించవలసివుంది. రాయల్సీమ ప్రాంతంలో ఎన్నో బస్ రూట్లు యజమానులు మూసివేస్తున్నారు. ఉదాహరణకు మా కర్నూల్ జిల్లాలోని నంద్యాల-నందికోట్లూరు రూట్ విషయం గమనించండి. ఒక కంపెనీవారు ఇక్కడ కొంతకాలం బస్సులు నడిపారు. కాని గిట్టుబాటు కానందువల్ల ఆ రూటులో బస్సులను తిప్పుట మానివేశారు. ఇదేవిధంగా అనేక ప్రాంతాలలో బస్ సౌకర్యమైనా లేకపోవుటచేత ప్రజలు ఎన్నో ఇబ్బందులపాలు కావలసి వస్తోంది. ఇటువంటి ప్రాంతాలలో ప్రభుత్వం బస్సులను నడవవలసి వున్నది. సంగమేశ్వరం-ఆత్మకూరు, నంద్యాల-నందికోట్లూరు బస్సు, తెలుగోడ-ఓరవగల్లు-కర్నూలు బస్సు, ఆత్మకూరు-మార్కాపురం బస్సు, సంగమేశ్వరం-కర్నూలు బస్సు, సంగమేశ్వరం-ఆత్మకూరు బస్సు, ఈ రూట్లపై 16 బస్సులు ఎవ్వరికి నష్టము కాకుండా నడిపించవచ్చు. కొత్త బస్సులను కనుక నేను చెప్పిన రూట్లలో ప్రభుత్వం నడిపిస్తే వారికి రీతి వేలు రూపాయలు అదనపు ఆదాయం వస్తుందని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. అదే విధంగా అనేక చోట్ల ప్రభుత్వం బస్సులను నడుపవచ్చు. తద్వారా ఎన్నో కోట్ల రూపాయల ఆదాయాన్ని పొందవచ్చు. ఈ విషయమై ప్రభుత్వంవారు ఏమైనా ఆలోచిస్తున్నారా అని అడుగుతున్నాను. అదనపు ఖర్చులు వేసి ప్రజలను, ప్రయాణీకులను బాధించేస్తే ఈ విధంగా మోటార్ రవాణా అభివృద్ధి చేసి అధిక ఆదాయాన్ని సంపాదించడం మంచిదని ప్రభుత్వంవారికి విన్నవిస్తున్నాను. ప్రతిపక్ష సభ్యులు నిర్దాకా తృక్కుమైన సలహాలు ఇవ్వటంలేదని ప్రభుత్వంవారు నెలవివ్వడం పరిపాటి అయిపోయింది. అదిమాత్రం ఎన్నడూ సరికాదు. మేము నిర్దాకా తృక్కుమైన సూచనలనే యిస్తున్నాము. ఉదాహరణగా కొన్ని విషయాలు చేస్తాను. రెవెన్యూ బోర్డు విషయం చూడండి. లక్షలాది రూపాయలు దీనిని గురించి ఖర్చవుతోంది. అనేక పర్యాయాలు కాంగ్రెసువారు రెవెన్యూ బోర్డు అనవసరం అంటూ చెపుతుండేవారు. కాని ఆచరణలో వారు ఏమి చేస్తున్నాడు? రెవెన్యూ బోర్డును రద్దుచేయలేదు సరికదా, దానిని స్థిరంగా ఉంచటానికి ప్రయత్నిస్తున్నారు. అలాగే గవర్నరుయొక్క సౌకర్యంకోసం వేలాది రూపాయలు వెచ్చిస్తున్నారు. అలాగే అనేకమంది భూస్వాములపైన, పెట్టుబడిదారులపైన పన్ను విధించటానికి ఈ ప్రభుత్వం వారు వెనుకాడుతున్నారు. ఈ పథ్య కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వ మంత్రులలో ఒకరు పెద్ద వ్యాపారస్థులు అక్రమంగా income-tax రెక్కలకు చూపకుండా చూచుకొన్న జబ్బు 82 కోట్లవరకు వున్నదని చెప్పారు. ఈ 82 కోట్లలో దాదాపు 5 కోట్ల రూపాయలు నున రాష్ట్రంలోని పెద్ద వ్యాపారస్థులు ఎగబెట్టివటించిందేనని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. అయితే ఈ ప్రభుత్వం ఎందువల్ల ఈ అదనపు ఆదాయాన్ని స్వాధీనం చేసుకోదు అని అడుగుతున్నాను. ఈ ప్రభుత్వానికి వ్యాపారస్తులంటేనూ, పెట్టుబడిదారులంటేనూ భయమా అని తిరిగి ప్రశ్నిస్తున్నాను. లేకపోయినట్లైతే నిజంగా ఈ ప్రభుత్వం వ్యాపారస్తులు దాచిన అక్రమ ఆదాయాన్ని స్వాధీనం చేసుకోవాలి. ప్రజాసామాన్యాన్ని దోపిడిచేసి ఆర్జించిన ఈ అదనపు మొత్తాలను ప్రభుత్వం స్వాధీనం చేసుకోవటానికి ఎందుకు జంకుతుంది? పెద్ద వ్యాపారస్థులకు దండగ వస్తుందనా లేక ఆ సొమ్మును ఆర్జించుటకు వారు అవలంబించిన పద్ధతులు సక్రమమైనట్టినా? ఈ ప్రభుత్వం ప్రజాసామాన్యాన్ని సంతోష పెట్టే ప్రభుత్వమా లేక పెట్టుబడిదారులను, భూస్వాములను రక్షించే ప్రభుత్వమా అని అడుగుతున్నాను. మరొక్క విషయం

5-30
P.M.

5th December 1952] [Sri C. Pulla Reddi]

గమనించండి. ఈ దేశాన్నుంచి బ్రిటిష్ సామ్రాజ్యవాదులు ఏటా 125 కోట్ల వరకు లాభాలను తమ దేశానికి తరలించుకొని పోతున్నారు. బ్రిటిష్ పెట్టుబడులను స్వాధీనం చేసుకోండి. ఆ సంస్థలను ప్రభుత్వంవారే నిర్వహించండి అని ఎన్నోసార్లు మేము తెలియజేశాము. ఈ దేశ ప్రజానీకాన్ని బ్రిటిష్ పెట్టుబడిదారులు దోచుకోవడం ఈ ప్రభుత్వం సహిస్తున్నదా అని అడుగుతున్నాను. విదేశీయుల దోపిడికి కూడా ప్రజలను గురిగావిస్తూ యింకా అదనపు పన్నులువేసి వారిని పీడించడం వలన ప్రజల న్యాయంకాదని ప్రభుత్వంవారికి తెలియజేస్తున్నాను. బస్సుల మీద పన్నులు అధికం చేసినట్లైతే ఆ పన్నును ఇచ్చుకొనవలసివచ్చిన ప్రయాణీకులే కాని బస్ యజమానులు ఎంతమాత్రంకాదని తెలియజేస్తున్నాను. ఈ విధంగా ప్రజలపై పన్ను భారాన్ని అధికం చేయడం హానాస్పదమైన విషయమని ప్రభుత్వంవారు గుర్తించాలి. ఈ బిల్లుపై ప్రభుత్వం ప్రజానిష్ఠాప్రాయాన్ని తెలుసుకోవలసిన అభిప్రాయం ఎంతైనా ఉన్నదని తెలియజేస్తూ ఇంతటితో విరమిస్తున్నాను.”

* SRI V. SRI KRISHNA :—“ అధ్యక్షా, ఈ బిల్లును నేను oppose చేస్తున్నాను. ఈ బిల్లు సెలెక్టు కమిటీవారు ఆమోదించినది కాకపోవడం మే ఇందుకు కారణము, మొదట ప్రభుత్వంవారు ప్రతిపాదించి సెలెక్టు కమిటీకి పంపిన బిల్లును సెలెక్టు కమిటీవారు సముగ్రంగా చర్చించి మార్పులు చేశారు. సెలెక్టు కమిటీవారి అభిప్రాయాలను త్రోసిపుచ్చి, కొత్త బిల్లును ప్రవేశపెట్టడం సబబుకాదు. దీనివల్ల మొదట సెలెక్టు కమిటీని వేసిన ప్రయోజనం లేకుండాపోయింది. మొదట బిల్లు పెట్టినప్పుడు బడ్జెటులో కొంత లోటును పూర్తిచేసేందుకు యీ పన్నును విధించే బిల్లును తెచ్చారు. కొత్త పన్నులు విధించే సందర్భంలో ప్రజల పరిస్థితులనుకూడా దృష్టిలో పెట్టుకోవాలి. రాష్ట్రములో ప్రజల ఆర్థిక పరిస్థితులు సరిగా లేనప్పుడు పన్నుల భారము ఎక్కువచేస్తే ప్రజలు మరింత ఇబ్బందులు పడగలరు. ఈ బిల్లునుపట్టి బస్సు ఆపరేటర్లు, లారీ ఆపరేటర్లు మీదనే పన్ను వేస్తామంటున్నారు. ప్రభుత్వం ఆపరేటర్లనుంచి వసూలుచేస్తే, ఆపరేటర్లు ప్రజలనుంచి వసూలు చేస్తారు. కాబట్టి యిది ప్రజలను యిబ్బందిపరచే బిల్లుగాని, ఆపరేటర్లకొరకు పెట్టిన బిల్లుగా కనబడడములేదు. ప్రభుత్వానికి డబ్బు చాలదంటే ఖర్చును తగ్గించాలి. అంతేకాని ప్రజలను ఏదో రూపంగా వాధించితే ప్రయోజనమేమి అని అడుగుతున్నాను. ఆనాడు జమీందారి ఎజోలిషను బిల్లు వచ్చినప్పుడు జమీందార్లకు నష్టపరిహారం ఇవ్వనక్కరలేదని ప్రతిపక్ష సభ్యులు కోరగా, వారి కోరికను నిరాకరించి జమీందార్లకు నష్టపరిహారం క్రింద 12½ కోట్లవరకు కట్టిస్తున్నారు. ఆ పరిహారముక్రింద యివ్వాలన్న డబ్బు యింకావున్నదని అంటున్నారు. ఎటులైనా యిప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వానికి డబ్బులేని సమయములో యీ జమీందార్లకు యీ నష్టపరిహారము యివ్వడమనేది అచ్యుతంలేని వాండ్ర రూపములో యివ్వమంటే ప్రభుత్వం ఆదీ గూడా చేయజాలమంటున్నారు. ఇంకను ఈ జమీందార్లకు 7½ కోట్లవరకు యివ్వవలసి వుందంటున్నారు. ఈ డబ్బు వివిధంగా వసూలుకాగలదని ప్రభుత్వాన్ని అడుగుతున్నాను. ప్రజలను పీల్చుకుటిని ఈ లోటును పూర్తిచేయటానికి ఈ ప్రభుత్వం తయారవుతున్నది. అందుకనే ఖర్చును తగ్గించాలని అంటున్నాను.

“ రెండవ విషయం మనవిచేస్తాను. ఈనాడు ప్రజలందరిమీద ఏదోరూపములో పన్ను వేసి వసూలుచేస్తున్నారు. ధనికవర్గాలను విడిచిపెట్టి, పేదప్రజానీకాన్ని, చిన్న వ్యాపారస్తులను, పీడించి, ఎడోరకములో కన్నులు వసూలుచేస్తున్నారు. వీరందరు సామాన్య ప్రజానీకానికి చెందినవారని ప్రభుత్వానికి తెలుసు. ధనికవర్గమువారినుంచి పెద్దపెద్ద వ్యాపారస్థులనుంచి వసూలుచేయడానికి ప్రభుత్వం తలపెట్టినా, వారికి కట్ట

[Sri V. Sri Krishna] [5th December 1952]

గల శక్తి వుంటుంది. అంతేగాని బీదప్రజలను పీక్కుతంటే మేము ప్రయోజనమని అడుగు తున్నాను. కాబట్టి ఈ పేదరైతాంగమునంచి, చిన్నచిన్న వ్యాపారస్థులనుంచి వసూలుచేయడం మానుకోవాలని అంటున్నాను. గత బడ్జెటు సమావేశములో ప్రతి పక్ష సభ్యులమైన మేము ఈ సూచనలు చేయగా, ఆ సూచనలు అన్నియు ప్రభుత్వం నిరాకరించింది. కాబట్టి మేము చేసిన సూచనలన్నియు దృష్టిలో పెట్టుకొని పన్నులు వేసే విధానంలో ప్రభుత్వం మార్పులేవాలని అంటున్నాను.

“ఇకపోతే ఈనాడు బస్సులమీదను, లారీలమీదను taxation proposals ప్రభుత్వంవారు తెచ్చారు. దేశంలో బస్సులు లారీలు పెట్టుకున్నవారిలో ధనికులున్నారు, పేదవారు వున్నారు. ధనికులు జాస్తిగా బస్సులను పెట్టుకున్నారు, పేదవారు ఒకటి రెండు, మూడు, బస్సులుగాని లారీలుగాని పెట్టుకుని జీవించేవాళ్ళు వున్నారు. యీ ఒకటి, రెండు, మూడు బస్సులుగాని, లారీలుగాని పెట్టుకున్నవాళ్ళు పేద, మధ్య తరగతికి చెందినవారుగా వున్నారు. వారికి ఉన్నటువంటి యిల్లు వాకిలి తెగపట్టి ఈ లారీలను బస్సులనుకొని నడుపుకొంటున్నవారూ ఉన్నారూకూడా. పన్నులు సక్రమంగా వసూలుచేసి, సర్వీసున అయిదుముల్లకింద ఖర్చు పెట్టినట్లయితే మంచిదే. ప్రభుత్వం ఈ డబ్బును దుర్వినియోగం చేస్తున్నదేగాని సర్వీసునియోగం చేయడంలేదు. ఈ tax వేయడంలోకూడా అనేక సదుపాయాలు ఉన్నవి. ఒక్కొక్క రూటులో traffic పెద్దగా ఉన్నచోట, ఎక్కువ పన్ను వసూలుచేయవచ్చు. తక్కువగా వున్నచోట తక్కువ టాక్సువేస్తే ఈ ఆపరేటర్లు ప్రభుత్వానికి పన్ను కట్టడానికి కష్టపడరు. అట్లాంటిది అందరికీ ఒకేవిధముగా పన్నువేస్తే, traffic వున్నచోట అధిక లాభాలు గడించటానికి వీలవుతున్నది. Traffic లేనిచోట్ల లాభము రాకపోగా, నష్టానికి ఈ బస్సులు లారీలు నడుపవలసి ఉంటుంది. ఖర్చులకి గిట్టుబాటుకాక యీ చిన్న ఆపరేటర్లు యీ బండ్లు మూలుపెట్టుకోవలసి వస్తుంది. అదికాకపోతే అమ్ముకునే స్థితి పట్టుతుంది. కాబట్టి అధికంగా డబ్బువచ్చేచోట అధికముగావేస్తే లేనిచోట తక్కువగావేస్తే, ఈ ఆపరేటర్లు అంత కష్టపడరు. ఉదాహరణకు మారేపల్లె నుండి నీజాంపట్టణానికి బస్సు వున్నది. రేపల్లెనుంచి వందోలుమీదుగా పొన్నూరుకు బస్సు వున్నది. రైలుమార్గమువెంట బస్సు రోడ్డుగూడా వుంటే traffic అంతగా వుండదు. రైలు timings తప్పినప్పుడు మాత్రం వుంటుంది. రేపల్లెనుంచి నీజాం పట్టణమునకు రైలులేదు. Traffic కూడ అంతగాలేదు. రేపల్లెనుంచి పొన్నూరుకు direct గా short cut రైలు రూటు లేనందున traffic జాస్తిగా వుంటుంది. Traffic జాస్తిగా వున్నచోట ఎక్కువ tax వేసినను కష్టముండదు. అసలు traffic లేకపోతే tax ఎక్కడనుంచి కట్టగలడు. ఈ విషయం ప్రభుత్వం ముఖ్యంగా గమనించాలి.

“ఇంకొక విషయం చెప్పతున్నాను. నూ జిల్లాలో కొన్నిచోట్ల రోడ్డు వున్నవి. కొన్నిచోట్ల రోడ్డులేవు, రైలుగూడాలేదు. పోయిన మంత్రివర్గము వున్నప్పుడు రోడ్డు వున్నా లేకపోయినా బస్సు పర్మిట్లు యిచ్చారు. ముఖ్యంగా మంత్రిగారి బంధువులే పది, పదిహేను రూట్లకు పర్మిట్లు తెచ్చుకున్నారు. ఈ పర్మిట్లు గూటు వాట్యా అని చెప్పి ఇతరులకు అధిక లాభాలకు అమ్ముతున్నారు. మంత్రిగారి బంధువులే బస్సు రూట్లను పదిహేను వేల రూపాయలకు కొనుక్కొని పరాయివాళ్ళకు ఇరవై వేల రూపాయలకు అమ్ముతున్నారు. రూట్లను కొనుక్కొన్నవారు రోడ్డు వున్నా, లేకపోయినాగూడ బస్సును నడిపే చోట్లుగూడా వున్నాయని చెప్పతున్నారు. ప్రభుత్వం రోడ్డు వున్నదా, లేదా అని గమనించకుండా పర్మిట్లు యిచ్చింది. ప్రభుత్వం కట్ల మూసుకొని పరిపాలన సాగిస్తున్నదని ప్రజలు

5th December 1952] [Sri V. Sri Krishna]

అంటావచ్చారు. ఈ పర్జిల్లి విషయములో అనేక చేతులు మార్చుకున్నవాళ్లు గూడా వున్నారు. పర్జిల్లి తెచ్చుకునేది ఒకరు, రూటు వాల్ట్యు యిచ్చి కొనుక్కోనేది ఇంకొకరు, బస్సులు నడుపుకునేది మరి ఒకరుగా యంటున్నది. ఈ విషయములో నేను ఒక సూచన చేస్తున్నాను. ఆసలు రూట్ వాల్ట్యునే విహిరంగముగా అమ్మకానికి పెట్టకట్లయితే, ప్రభుత్వానికి మరింత లాభము చేకూరగలదు. ఈ విషయము లన్నియు ప్రభుత్వానికి ముఖ్య గమనార్హములు. మరొక సంగతి చెప్పుతున్నాను. ఈ టూకేస్ వక్ ప్రపోజల్స్ విషయములో మిత్రుడు వావిలాల గోపాలకృష్ణయ్యగారు కొన్ని సూచనలు చేశారు. ఆ వివరాలన్నియు మన పరిశ్రమల మంత్రిగారికి పూర్తిగా తెలుసును. దేశములో కొంతమంది ఒకటిగాదు, రెండుగాదు, తొందైదుడు బస్సులు దాకా పెట్టుకున్నవాళ్లున్నారు. యాభై బస్సులు పెట్టుకున్నవారు ఉన్నారు. ఒకటి, రెండు, మూడు, బస్సులు పెట్టుకున్నవాళ్లుగూడా వున్నారు. ఎక్కువ బస్సులు పెట్టుకున్నవాళ్లను, ఒక రూటులో రాకపోతే, ఒక బస్సులో రాకపోతే, యింకొక బస్సులోగాని యింకొక రూటులోగాని వసూంటే, నష్టాలు పూడ్చుకుంటూ, లాభాలు సంపాదించుచున్నారు. ఒకటి, రెండు, మూడు, బస్సులు పెట్టుకున్నవాళ్లు లాభాలు రాకపోగా వచ్చేది కాస్తా పన్నులు కట్టడానికి, ఖర్చులు భరించటానికి చాలకుండా యిబ్బందులు పడుతున్నారు. వీరందరికీ ఒకే విధమైన టూక్సు వేయటం మంచిది కాదని అంటున్నాను. కొంతమంది ధనికవర్గమువారు బస్సులు కొనుక్కొని నడుపుకొనేందుకు శక్తిగలవారికి, నూటికి అయిదు రూపాయలు లాభాలతో రూట్లను అమ్మకున్నవాళ్లుగూడా ఉన్నారు. ప్రభుత్వమునుండి మంత్రుల బంధువు గానో, సిఫార్సులు భవయోగించో, పర్జిల్లి సంపాదించి అమ్మకుంటున్నారు. ఇదే పని ప్రభుత్వాన్ని చేయమంటున్నాను. విహిరంగముగా రూట్లను అమ్మితే శక్తి గలవారు కొంటారు. అప్పుడే ప్రభుత్వానికి లాభము రావటానికి వీలుంటుంది. కొంతమంది లారీలు ఎక్కువగా పెట్టుకోలేనివారు యీ ఓనర్లే డ్రైవర్లుగా ఉండేవారున్నారు. డ్రైవర్లు వారే, క్లీనర్లు వారే. అట్లు చేయడమునకు కారణ మేమిటంటే, ప్రభుత్వం వేసే పన్ను కట్టటానికేగాని, యితరులకు లాభాలు పంచి యివ్వటములో పాగలటానికి వీలులేకగాని, యిటువంటి ఇతర ఖర్చులు భరించ లేకననే చెప్పాలి. ఈ కారణంచేతనే కొంతమంది మధ్య తరగతికి చెందిన వేదవారు యీ బస్సులు, లారీలను స్వంతముగా నడుపుకుంటూ ఉన్నారు. ఇది కాకుండా పోలీసువారి మామూళ్ల బాధ ఒకటిగూడా ఉందని తెలియజేస్తున్నాను. వీరందరికీ మామూళ్లు యివ్వకపోతే, బండ్లు బయటికి రావు. ఈ రకమైన ఖర్చులు భరించాంటే, చివరకు యీ చిన్న ఆఫీసర్లకు ఏమి మిగిలి, వాళ్ల కుటుంబ పోషణ జరుగుతుందో గమనించాలి. ఈ మధ్య తరగతికి చెందిన వేదవాళ్ల జీవన స్థితి బాగుపర్చాలని ప్రభుత్వమునకు నిజంగా ఉండేట్లయితే, నా సూచనలను దృష్టిలో పెట్టుకోవాల్సి మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. ఈ విషయా లన్నియు పరిశీలించ వలసిన అవసర మున్నది. అందుకనే యీ బిల్లు మార్చబడిన బిల్లు కాకట్టి, దీనిని మరల యింకొక సెలెక్టు కమిటీకి వేయాలంటాను. బస్సులను, లారీలను నడుపుటలోగల కష్టసుఖాలు తెలిసినవారే యీ కమిటీలో వుండాలి. అప్పుడే యీ బిల్లు పూర్తిగా పరిశీలించబడగలదు.

“ఈ విషయములో మరొక సూచన చేయదలచాను. మన మద్రాసు సీటీ 5-40
బస్సు సర్వీసువల్ల ప్రభుత్వమువారికి ఇరవై లక్షలు ఆదాయం వచ్చిందని మన P.M.

[Sri V. Sri Krishna] [5th December 1952]

మంత్రిగారు కలవిచ్చారు. ఇది యింకను సక్రమముగా పరిశీలించి సక్రమ పద్ధతులలో యీ బిల్లును నడిపించినట్లయితే ప్రభుత్వానికి అధిక లాభాలు రాగలవు. అంత లాభము వచ్చినప్పుడు డ్రైవర్లకు క్లీనర్లకు జీతాలు ఎక్కువ చేసినను పరవాలేదు. నా సూచన లన్ని యీనను ప్రభుత్వమువారు గమనించి ఈ బిల్లును పునఃపరిశీలించుటకుగాను ఒక సెలెక్టు కమిటీకి పంపమని అంటున్నాను.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Sir, I wish to intervene at a very early stage, so that the discussion could be carried on without interruption, without any notion that I have wound up the debate. My colleague will no doubt reply in the usual course.

“ Sir, this Bill has been opposed generally and also by the regular dilatory motions for referring it to public opinion, to the Select Committee; etc. So far as the points of order which were raised are concerned, I am not examining them now. I am only referring to the merits of the case with reference to the dilatory motions. This Bill has gone—though as a matter of law it is a new Bill—through a Select Committee, and this Bill is worded and the provisions are shaped exactly in terms of the report of that Select Committee. That is the reason why the Government are not accepting the usual motions for a Select Committee and a *fortiori* for the Bill being referred for public opinion, circulated or published. There is absolutely no substance on the merits in the proposal that it should be referred to a new Select Committee once again. The Select Committee was fully representative; it made its report, and on the basis of and precisely in accordance with the terms of that report, this Bill has been shaped.

“ Then, Sir, on the merits, hon. Members have spoken, almost with conviction, opposing the Bill. Member after Member, from the Communist party has risen to oppose the Bill in terms which made me almost imagine that they were not members of the Communist party at all. It is strange how Members of the Opposition are bound together by one ideal now, and only one ideal, viz., that this Government should be opposed. I once called it a hotch-potch, and I am sorry to say that nothing in all the developments that were referred to casually this morning in the other House as well as here, has led me to think that there is anything more than a hotch-potch even now on the Opposition side. But the hotch-potch is permeated by one sacred doctrine that the present Ministry should be opposed in all their measures. Sir, here is a Bill which proposes to tax, not the passengers, not the ‘ masses of the people ’, but a certain body of operators. And these operators are those who have been, according to all published and private reports, fairly successful these few years in a certain direction, viz., transport with motor spirit. Roads have been improved and there have been great conveniences given to those people and passengers also have been trained in the habit of moving about only in buses or transports, or mechanical conveyances, and they have almost forgotten the old art of using their own legs—in fact every convenience has been provided for these operators, and everybody also

5th December 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

believed that they were making tons of money, and in fact they largely operated during the last elections also, if I may say so, fairly successfully. Now, when we thought that the one tax which would perhaps not be opposed by the Opposition would be a tax on this profession, it is a strange thing to see and hear, Member after Member rising from the Communist benches—I would not have minded or even been surprised if Independent Members got up or progressive independents or unattached independents, all got up but I was surprised to see the old enemies of vested interests and of all unearned incomes rising up and explaining how iniquitous this measure is. Now, I must say, if you will permit me, Sir, that the Communist party will never get out of their underground habit; even though they are allowed to function in the open, even though they are allowed every privilege of a citizen, to act in the open and oppose the Government or carry on political propaganda, they seem to prefer to infiltrate, they seem to shut their eyes and burrow under the ground and go to the young men in the colleges and to the students in the high schools—they want to start student federations and operate hunger marches of weavers, about whom the Chief Minister is not at all concerned, but the Communist alone is concerned!—they bring together all sorts of people under various covers—it is all the old habit. And I beg of the new Leader of the Party, Mr. Ramamurthi, to drop this habit and function in the open and never go about with a mask over his face and operate in this manner. Now they are operating in favour of the oppressed bus operators (Laughter)—and we are told, the Government is an enemy of the bus operators, the Communist party is a friend of the bus operators! This is the slogan now. What use is all this? May I appeal, as an old gentleman, merely having the future of the country before us, let us operate together, at least in some matters. Here we have passed the Budget—the Budget is an old story—and we showed definitely that we will have a deficit of Rs. 3 to Rs. 4 crores but let me mention to hon. Members, it will not be Rs. 3 or Rs. 4 crores; I should not be surprised if my colleague the Finance Minister will have to present a revised statement showing a deficit not of Rs. 3 or Rs. 4 crores or Rs. 5 crores, but even Rs. 10 crores. I should not be surprised at it, and why? Are we stealing the money month after month in crores? Are we expending it on any new aspects or services? We are spending money on famine-relief, we are pouring money like water on the construction of public works, and famine relief measures. District after district is making demands, on our poor purse, and instead of rain we are pouring money like water. When the rains came, the cyclone came also, and God knows what will be our expenditure on relief measures of that kind. Now, I say I should not be surprised if our deficit goes into Himalayan proportions this year. It is our revenue account and not capital expenditure. It is not a ways and means deficit, it is a revenue deficit. Can we carry on the Government and get bonuses and subventions from the Centre and depend entirely on them? Sir, I do hope that the Centre will be generous and will help us against national calamities

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [5th December 1952]

like these. When we all met in the Finance Ministers' Conference, at the Central Finance Minister's invitation, at Delhi, we expressed what we felt. Naturally, the Central Finance Minister was extremely embarrassed, disturbed by the manner in which we made out our case for subventions from the Centre. He was not at all pleased with me, let me tell you. But what explanation could I give? I said, 'We are trying our very best; this is a national calamity, a natural calamity; we cannot cope with it, we are doing our best; we are reducing whatever programme is not necessary, and we are raising taxes also, and you know the composition of the House; almost half the House is against the Government, all of them combining against any measure which the Government bring forward,—nor for strengthening the Ministerial party but for maintaining a stable Government, and nothing more.' Again, I said, 'I am asking only for this year; I am not asking for the next year even; and measures are being taken to balance the Budget, so that the public credit may be maintained. And there is the Opposition. Under these circumstances, you have to help us.' That is what I said to the Finance Minister in Delhi. And here we are carrying out our promise, we are carrying out our threat, so to say, viz., to introduce taxation bills. We gave notice to the entire country at the time of the Budget that we must bring in these measures and public opinion has also been concentrated in a large measure on all these. Then, we have notified also the Central Ministry that we are doing our best this day and so we are bringing in this measure. We cannot bring in a measure which will bring several crores; we can only do things within the limits we have as our resource and we can bring in only such a measure as this. In fact, I have thrust this unpleasant duty on my two colleagues, the Hon. Finance Minister, who is young and who should have been treated better by me, and the Hon. Minister for Industries and Labour who should have been treated much more kindly by me than by his being asked to move a Bill of this kind. It is necessary and I thought that at least here,—never mind the position as tenants, landlords, police, or murders, enquiries into 1948 to 1949 and all that—in a measure where we propose to put taxes on those who can bear it—and who themselves have suggested various reductions and we have agreed to them—there will not be opposition. And in fact, hon. Members have seen one of the men concerned in that industry rising and speaking; though his heart is not in it, he does not want to be taxed, yet he sees the reasonableness of the suggestion and he supported it not by noting but by speaking on it also. But, what do I see here? Mr. Gopalakrishnaiah, Mr. Sri Krishna and more than all, my friend, Mr. Kalyanasundaram and member after member, iron-hearted Communists getting up and saying 'do not levy this tax, do not worry the bus operators'. I am surprised, Sir, at this attitude. It only shows that we do not intend to help one another; we intend only to be partisans and nothing else. I am sorry for this. I appeal to hon. Members not to oppose this Bill. Mr. Kalyanasundaram says 'get a part of the revenue from the railways.' Of course he is connected very intimately with the railways and is making it as

5-50
p.m.

5th December 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

difficult as possible for the railways; and inspite of him the Railway Ministry gets some money. He says 'get a part of their money' as if there were provision for getting that money. In the old days there was a provision by which the railway income and the income-tax were pooled together and a division was made and under the Niemeyer Award we were getting a share. We are not getting all that we were getting before. Income-tax and railway revenues are now distributed in a different way.

"Then, another Communist member rises and talks saying 'tax the European gentleman who have gone to England; stop their pension, or take a small army and invade England if you like and get back the 20 crores.' (Interruption.) It is an exaggeration a slight exaggeration and my Friends will forgive me for making the exaggeration in deference to their own habit in that matter. (Laughter.) He says 'carry a war against pensioners, against zamindars' and so on. Again, I am sure, Sir, if I really brought in a measure to get some more money from the zamindars, or get some more money from the pensioners, they would oppose that measure also and I have no doubt about it whatever, by reason of their common ideal that Rajaji's measures must be opposed whatever they may be.

"Sir, this is not politics; this is not Government; this is not opposition. I want the Communist now that they have come in to the open, to drop this sabotage, financial or otherwise, to drop these underground tactics. Let them go to the students and say 'We are Communists, you must join us.' But let them not say 'Join the Students' Federation'. Let them not go and tell poor P. T. Rajan and other such innocent people 'this is a peace movement, you shall join us'. Peace movement! No, Sir, this is not a peace movement but a war movement. (Interruption.) No, Sir, you object to that and I withdraw."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—"Sir, on a point of . . ."

MR. SPEAKER :—"The Hon. Minister is not yielding."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—"I only wish I should be given an opportunity of replying to it."

MR. SPEAKER :—"Yes."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"That is why I got up early to intervene and I am prepared to be contradicted, to be opposed, to be ill-described, if necessary up to cent per cent. I do not mind it. I am only trying to describe as I understand them. It is not as if I do not sympathise with some of their ideals. In fact, I do sympathise. But, why this underground method, why this mask, why not go straight? There is no necessity now to cover these things. Why should you say 'students' Federation'? You should say 'Communist Party.' Why should you say that it is a peace movement? You should say it is the 'Communist Party'. I know that the Communist Party cannot flourish without peace

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [5th December 1952]

but why should they go about and say 'join the peace movement.' Why not say that it is the Communist Party peace movement? Why try to entrap people? Why try to hide facts here also? Say, 'We are Communists; we do not want this Government and therefore we oppose this Bill as a vote of no-confidence.' Why say 'Our heart melts in favour of the bus operators.' I object to this attitude. Let us be fair; let us play cricket and now there is no rain to disturb it, let us play cricket."

6 p.m.

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—"అధ్యక్ష, నేను యీ అసెంబ్లీలో యీనాడు యీ విధమైనటువంటి ఉపన్యాసము చేస్తానని ఎన్నడును ఊహించుకొనలేదు. అయితే యిప్పుడు నేను మన ముఖ్య మంత్రి శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారి గారికి అధినందనలు తెలుపవలసియున్నది. విలసనగా, వారు మాట్లాడిన సందర్భములు వివ్రేనప్పటికీ మాట్లాడ దలచుకున్నప్పుడు ఒక సారి మాట్లాడమే కాకుండా, వారికి నేను జవాబు చెప్పవలసినవచ్చినందువల్ల నేను వారికి అధినందనలు తెలుపాలి. మేము లోట్లు తీస్తున్నాము అని వారు చెప్పిన తర్వాత వారికి జవాబు యివ్వవలసిన విషయము వచ్చింది. ఇప్పుడు ఉన్నటువంటి సమయములో, అందులో సందర్భముకాని సందర్భములో వారు మాట్లాడిన విషయములలో సందర్భముకాని విషయాలకూడా వున్నవి, గనుక వారు నేను మాట్లాడటానికి అవకాశము యిచ్చినందుకుకూడా వారికి నేను అధినందనలు తెలుపాలి. అయితే ప్రధానమైనటువంటి విషయము ఏమిటంటే కమ్యూనిస్టులు యీనాడు ప్రభుత్వం వేసేటటువంటి పన్నులు వ్యతిరేకిస్తున్నారు అని ముఖ్య మంత్రిగారు చెప్పారు. దానికి ప్రధానమైనటువంటి కారణములు అనేక మున్నవి. అవి నేను యిప్పుడు చెప్పుచున్నాను. ఈనాడు ప్రభుత్వం వేసేటటువంటి పన్నులు వేయదలచినది, ప్రజలయొక్క ప్రస్తుత ఆర్థిక పరిస్థితులు దృష్ట్యా చూస్తే, వారు బడ్జెటు చక్కబెట్టుకోలేక వేసినటువంటి పన్ను, లేకపోతే బడ్జెటును చక్కపెట్టుకోటానికి వీలు ఉండిన్నికూడా యీ నాడు పన్ను వేస్తున్నారా అనే విషయాలనుగురించి ఆలోచించవలసియున్నది. అలాంటి విషయము అన్నియు ఆనాడు బడ్జెటు చర్చ సందర్భములో మేము ప్రభుత్వ దృష్టికి తెచ్చాము. ప్రభుత్వాన్ని ఆలోచించమని కోరాము. వారిని ఇంకను అభ్యర్థించాము. కాని మా అభ్యర్థన తోసివేయబడింది. ప్రభుత్వం పన్ను వేయాలని నిశ్చయించుకొని కూర్చున్నటువంటి విషయము యీనాడు జరిగేటటువంటి చర్చ అయి యున్నది. ఈ విషయము ప్రభుత్వం గ్రహించకుండా కమ్యూనిస్టుపార్టీ ప్రభుత్వం పన్నులు వేయదలచినవి వివిధ అయినను, ఏ సమయంలోను వ్యతిరేకిస్తుంది అని కమ్యూనిస్టుపార్టీ మీద వ్యతిరేకపు ప్రచారము యీనాడు యావప్రభుత్వం చేస్తున్నది. కాని, యిది సత్యమారమైన ప్రచారం నేను చెప్పవలసినవచ్చింది. ఈ నాడు దేశములో ప్రజలయొక్క పరిస్థితి గమనించమని ప్రభుత్వాన్ని కోరుతున్నాము. ప్రజల పరిస్థితి ప్రధాన మంత్రిగారు గమనించకుండా ఈ పన్ను విధానమును తలపెట్టారు. ప్రభుత్వానికి ఆర్థికదుస్థితి వచ్చినందువల్ల యీపన్ను విధించాలని అంటారు. ఈ సమయములో ప్రజలమీద యీ పన్ను భారము వేయతగునా అనేదే ప్రశ్న. ఈనాడు ప్రజలు కరువుతో బాధపడుతూ ఉన్నప్పుడు, ఈ ప్రజల మీదనే పన్ను వేసి యింకను బాధపెట్టకుండా యింక దేనిమీద నైనను పన్ను వేయుటకు వీలు ఉన్నదా లేదా, యింక ఏమైన మార్గమున్నదా లేదా అని ఆలోచించకుండా ఈ ప్రజలమీదనే వేయుటకు నిశ్చయించారు. వినాదో పదివిండ్ల క్రితం ప్రజలు బన్నులు పెట్టి, లాబీలు పెట్టి లాభాలు గణించారు. అందుకు

5th December 1952] [Sri T. Nagi Reddi]

యిప్పుడు పన్ను వేసి అదంతా గుంజుచూసునే భావము ప్రభుత్వంకు ఉన్నట్లు కనిపించుచున్నది. నిజానికి Select Committee లో కొంతమంది ఈ పన్ను వేయడం మంచిది కాదని అభిప్రాయమిచ్చినను, ప్రభుత్వం ఈనాడు ఈ బిల్లును తెచ్చారు. ఈనాటి పరిస్థితులనుబట్టి ప్రభుత్వం యిదివరకు అనుబంధపు Taxes లో గాని, General Administration లో గాని Police Administration లో గాని యీ లోటును పూర్తిచేయుటకు మార్గములు ఏమైనా ఉన్నవా లేవా అనేవిషయం ప్రభుత్వం ఆలోచించారా అనేదే ప్రశ్న. కమ్యూనిస్టులు హింసా వాదులు అని మరొకరూపమైన దూషణ ప్రారంభించారు. కమ్యూనిస్టు పార్టీ ఏమైనా సూచనలు చేస్తే అవి ప్రభుత్వం పాటించలేదు. నిజానికి యీనాడు Police Administration క్రింద దాని అభ్యుదయ కార్యక్రమమునకాను ఎంతో ఖర్చు ప్రభుత్వము పెట్టుకూ మేము చెప్పవలసిన అవసరము లేదని భావించి, మా సలహాలు పాటించలేదు. కుమారప్ప లాంటి వారు, సుందర్ లాల్ లాంటి వారు యిచ్చిన సలహాలు గమనించగోరారు. ప్రభుత్వం ప్రజలమీద పన్నులువేసి మరి ఒక ఖర్చుకు సంపాదించి పెట్టడం కనబడుచున్నది. ఈ లోటును పూర్తిచేయుటకు పన్నులు వేయకుండా మరొక పరిష్కార మార్గం కన్పించలేదా అనే విషయాన్ని కమ్యూనిస్టుపార్టీ తరపునను, అందరి సభ్యులతరపునను, అడుగుతున్నాను.

“ఇకపోతే administration విషయం తీసుకోండి. ఈనాడు ప్రభుత్వం ఖర్చు యింకను పెంచువెంటానికి తలపెట్టుచున్నది. ఈ ఖర్చు తగ్గించటానికి ఇదివరకే కమ్యూనిస్టుపార్టీ ఎన్నో సలహాలు యిచ్చింది. అవన్నియు త్రొసివేయబడ్డాయి. ఈ ఖర్చుకు ఒక Plan అవసరమని చెప్పియున్నాము. ఏ ఆయుటము క్రింద ఎంత ఖర్చు ఆవుతున్నదన్న విశదపరచమని కోరియున్నాము. ఈనాడు కరువుప్రాంతాలలో కరువు నివారణ పనులు పెట్టించారు. ఈనాడు రాయలసీమలో కరువు నివారణ పనులు కొన్ని చోట్లపెట్టారేకాని, అన్నిప్రాంతాలలో పెట్టించారా అని అడుగుతున్నాను. రోజు రోజుకు నాకు వస్తున్నటువంటి పిటిషనులు, మహజరులు ప్రజలవద్దనుంచి ఎన్నో వందల కొలది వస్తున్నవి. ఒక మన మద్రాసు రాష్ట్రములో పోలీసు సిబ్బందికి ప్రభుత్వం ఖర్చుచేస్తున్న సొమ్ము మరెక్కడ ఖర్చు పెట్టుటమనేది ప్రభుత్వ దృష్టికి తెచ్చుచున్నాను. ఎంతనేమటికిని పోలీసు సిబ్బందిని వృద్ధిపరచడము, వాటి అభ్యుదయకార్య క్రమాలకే జాప్తి సొమ్ము ఈ ప్రభుత్వం ఖర్చు పెట్టుతున్నట్లు కనబడుచున్నదే కాని మరేమి కనబడుటలేదు. బహుశ పోలీసువారి దయా దాక్షిణ్యము ప్రభుత్వానికి కావలసివుంటుంది కాబోలు. అందుకనే పోలీసు సిబ్బందికొరకు ఎంతైనా ఖర్చు పెట్టుతున్నారు. ఈ పోలీసు సిబ్బందిని ఈ ఆనెంట్లలో ఎంతోమందిని వేతారు. దీనికి ఎంత ఖర్చు ఆవుతున్నదనే ఆలోచన ఈ ప్రభుత్వానికి ఉన్నదా అనే ప్రశ్న. ఈ అవసర సిబ్బందివల్ల ఎంతనష్టము ప్రభుత్వానికి కలుగుతున్నదో ఖచ్చితముగా చెప్పుతున్నాను. బహుశ ముఖ్యమంత్రిగారి పనుల కొరకు వారిలోటి పోలీసువారు ఉండడమనేదివారికి అలవాటు కాబోలు. 1937 సంవత్సరములో బ్రిటిషువారి హయంలో పోలీసు సిబ్బంది కొరకు ఎంత ఖర్చు అయియున్నదో ఆలోచించాలి. అటువంటిది గోరంతలు కొండంతలుగా జేసి, ఈ పోలీసు పరివారము హిమాలయా వర్యులుగా చేయబడింది. ఈరోజున ఈ ప్రజలకు ఈ వ్యయాన్ని గురించి జవాబు చెప్పుటకు సుసిద్ధంగా ఉన్నారా అని అడుగుతున్నాను. ఏదోఒక ఖర్చుకు, అది అవసరమైనప్పటికి ప్రజలమీద పన్నులువేసి బాధించకొన సాగించింది. ఈనాడు ప్రభుత్వంవేస్తున్నటువంటి పన్నులు దేనికి? ప్రజానీకం ఈరోజులలో లిండిగేక ఎంత బాధలు పడుతున్నారో ప్రభుత్వం ఏమైనా గుర్తించిందా? ఈ ప్రజానీకాన్ని సంరక్షించుటకు ప్రభుత్వం ఏమైనా చర్యలు తీసుకొన్నదా?

[Sri T. Nagi Reddi] [5th December 1952]

ఈ పన్ను వేయట ప్రజానీకముయొక్క సందర్భణకొరకు కాదు. అందుకనే ప్రభుత్వం వేసే పన్నులు మొత్తము వ్యతిరేకించ వలసిన అవసరం వచ్చింది కాబట్టి వ్యతిరేకించుచున్నామని అంటున్నాను.

“ ఇంకొక విషయం చెప్పదలచాను. ప్రభుత్వం జమీందారీ ఎటాబ్లిష్మెంట్ యాక్టు సందర్భములో జమీందారీలమీద పూర్తిపన్ను విల విధించకూడదు; వారికిచ్చే నష్ట పరిహారము బాండ్సు రూపములో యివ్వమని ప్రభుత్వమును కోరియున్నాము దానికి ప్రభుత్వము నిరాకరిస్తున్నది. వారికి యిచ్చే ధనము ఇప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వానికి కావలసిన లాటును పూర్తిచేసుకోవచ్చునుగదా అని అడుగుతున్నాను. ఇదిన్ని కాకుండా ప్రభుత్వ సిబ్బందిలో వెయ్యిరూపాయలకు పైగా జీతాలు యివ్వబడే సిబ్బందికి జీతములు తగ్గించాలని కోరగా దానికిని ప్రభుత్వము నిరాకరించింది. అట్టి పెద్ద తూములు జోలికి పోకుండా చిన్న చిన్న ఉద్యోగులు నోరులేనివాళ్లుగదా, పొట్టుకు సరిపోకుండా కాలక్షేపముచేసేవారి నోళ్లుకొట్టి ఈ ప్రభుత్వం తనకు కావలసినలాటును పూర్తిచేసుకోవలచినట్లు స్పష్టమగుచున్నది. ప్రభుత్వములో ఈనాడు యిటువంటి అవకతవకలు పెట్టుకొని నోరులేనివాళ్లు మీదకు, మీదా, బిక్కి జోలికిపోయి, నోరుగలవాళ్లు మీదకు పోకుండా పరిపాలన ప్రభుత్వం చేయదలచింది. ఈనాడు కమ్యూనిస్టు పార్టీ ప్రభుత్వము వేసే పన్నులకు అడ్డుతగులుతున్న దంటే, ముందు ప్రభుత్వ కార్యక్రమములో ఉన్నటువంటి అవకతవకలు సరిదిద్దుకొని ఆ తర్వాతనే పన్నులు విధానముతేడి అనిచెప్పుతున్నాను. ఈనాడు ఈ పన్నులు వేసి ప్రభుత్వ అవసరాలు తీర్చటానికి సరిసిద్ధంగా ఉన్నారా? అని అడుగుతున్నాను. కరువుతో ప్రజలు బాధపడుతుంటే, ఆ కరువు నివారణకు ప్రభుత్వం తగుమైన సంతృప్తికరమైనచర్యలు విమితిమీరిస్తోన్నదని ప్రశ్నిస్తున్నాను. మరొక విషయంలో ఈ సందర్భములో చెప్పాలి. 1943 వ సంవత్సరములో రాయలశివ లో కరువుతో ప్రజలు ఎన్ని బాధలను గురి అయియున్నారో అందరికీ తెలుసును. ఆ నాడు బ్రిటిషు సామ్రాజ్యములో బ్రిటిషువారు ఈ కరువు నివారణ ఎన్నెన్ని పనులు, ఎంతెంత డబ్బు ఖర్చుచేసియున్నారో, యీనాడు యీ ప్రభుత్వం ఎంత ఖర్చుచేసి, యే విధమైన పనులుచేశారు, అప్పటి రెక్కలు యిప్పటి రెక్కలు తీసి పరిశీలనచేయించండి. వాస్తవము అందరికీ బోధపడగలదు. అయినను ఈనాడు పన్ను వేయవలసిన అవసరము ఏమి ఉన్నది. ప్రజలయొక్క అవసరాలు తీర్చకుండా ప్రభుత్వ హక్కు దుర్వినియోగముచేసి, యీ నాడు బడ్జటు లోటువచ్చిందనే సాకుతో పన్ను, పన్ను అంటే, ప్రజల వద్ద డబ్బు ఎక్కడవున్నది, ఏ విధంగా వాళ్లు యివ్వగలరు అనే వివక్షణలేకుండా పన్ను వేయటానికి ప్రధాన మంత్రిగారు సిద్ధంగా కూర్చోన్నారు. సక్రమపరిపాలన లేదనే కమ్యూనిస్టులు యీ పన్ను విధానము వ్యతిరేకిస్తున్నారు. అందువల్లనే ఎవ్విధమైన పన్నుగూడా అంగీకరించటానికి ఏలులేదనే చెప్పుతున్నాను. మరొకవిషయం చెప్పదలచాను, చెప్పినదంతా వ్యతిరేకించడమే కర్తవ్యము. నేనేమైనా చెప్పితే అదిగూడా వ్యతిరేకించడం మీ కర్తవ్యమని ప్రధానమంత్రిగారు అన్నారు. అట్లాంటప్పుడు చెప్పిన దంతయు నేను నిరూపించాను. ఎంతెంత అయితే యీ (Tanjore Tenancy Bill) విషయంలో చెప్పామో, నూ amendments ఒకటికూడా ప్రభుత్వం ఆలకించలేదు. మాకు majority ఉన్న దృష్టితో తలపెట్టింది అంతా చేయడమే జరుగుచున్నది. ఆ బిల్లును మరొక రూపంలో తేడి అని ఎన్ని విధాలనో కోరినను అంతయును నిరాకరించిరి. ఇదంతయు బహుశే ప్రధానమంత్రిగారు మరచిపోయారు కాబోలు అని హెచ్చరికచేస్తున్నాను. యీ నాడు ప్రజల కర్తవ్యాన్ని గుర్తించక పన్నులువేసి ప్రజలను ఇబ్బందిపెట్టుటకు ప్రభుత్వం తలపెట్టింది. ప్రజానీకంపైన ముఖ్య మంత్రిగారు ఏవిధమైన అధిమానము, అదరణ చూపకుండా ఉన్నారు. కమ్యూనిస్టులుచేసేది ప్రధాన

5th December 1952] [Sri T. Nagi Reddi]

మౌలిక సౌకర్యాల కోరికను తెలుపుతున్నారు. మేము ఎల్లప్పుడూ ప్రజల యోగ క్షేమమునకే ప్రభుత్వానికి సూచనలు చేస్తే అవస్థలను నిరాకరించబడుతున్నాయి. ప్రభుత్వం ప్రజల యోగ క్షేమములు గమనించుచున్నారని ప్రజలకు తెలియాలంటే, వారి కొరకుచేసిన సూచనలు అంగీకరించాలి. కాని అవేమియు జరగడములేదు. ప్రభుత్వ చర్యలు బహిరంగంగా చెప్పటానికి సంసిద్ధంగా వున్నాము; మేమేదీ చేసినను మీరు నమ్మండి, మేము అడిగినదంతయు యివ్వండి; మమ్ములను నమ్మండి అని రాజగోపాలాచారి గారు అంటున్నారు. వీరు చెప్పిన ప్రకారము అయితే ప్రజలమీద యీ పన్ను భారము ఎలా వెయ్యవలెను. బహుశ వారికి కావలసినదంతయు జరుపుకోవటానికి కాబోలు ప్రజలను యీ విధంగా ముఖ్యపెట్టి నావంక చూడకురా—నామాలకాకి అని దూరముగా వుండాలి. ఎంత నేపటికిని కమ్యూనిస్టుల మీద దుష్ప్రచారము చేయుటయే యీ ప్రభుత్వ ఆలోచనగా కనబడుచున్నది. వారి దయపచ్చినట్లు చేయనిస్తే, ప్రజలకు ప్రయోగించక పోయినను మేదలకుండా పూరుకొమ్మని వారు అంటున్నారు. ప్రజలయోగ క్షేమం కొరకు చేసిన పనులేవి అని అడుగుతున్నాను. పోలీసు దురాంతాల విషయమే విచారణ పెట్టమంటే, దానిని కూడా ముఖ్యమంత్రిగారు నిరాకరించారు. ఏ విచారణ జరిపినను పోలీసు దురాంతాలను రుజువు చేయుటకు సంసిద్ధముగా ఉన్నాము. ప్రజలు యిట్టి విచారణలు పెట్టమని కోరుతున్నారు. ప్రజా ప్రతినిధులైనప్పటికీ ఆ భాధ్యత మరచి పోయి విచారణకు నిరాకరిస్తున్నారు. ప్రభుత్వం ఏదో సమాధానం చెప్పి తప్పించు కొంటున్నారని ప్రజలకు తెలియకపోలేదు. నేను చెప్పేది అంతా నమ్మండి అంటున్నారు. ప్రభుత్వం యీనాడు ప్రజలక్షేమంకోరి చేసింది యేమియులేదు. మేము ప్రజల జీవన శృతి వాగుచెయ్యాలనే బిల్లలను సవరించమంటే, అదంతయు ప్రాసేవేయడం జరుగు తున్నది. ఎంత నేపటికిని ప్రజను కృంగిదిసి నాశనము చేయాలనే తలంపుతో యీనాడు యీ బిల్లు ప్రభుత్వం తెచ్చింది. ప్రభుత్వం యీనాడు అవలంబించుచున్న విధానం పరిశీలించితే, ప్రజలను రైతాంగాన్ని నాశనము చేయనుద్దేశించిన యీ బిల్లు ప్రతిపాదించారు. ప్రజల ఆశయాలకోసం సూచనలు మేము చేస్తుంటే అవస్థలను నిరాకరిస్తున్నారు. ప్రజలమీద యీ పన్ను సేసితిరాలి అనే ఉద్దేశముతో ప్రభుత్వము యీ పన్ను వేయడానికి సిద్ధపడుచున్నారు. మేము కోరేది అంతయు కోరుతున్నాము. ప్రభుత్వము అదంతయు నిరాకరిస్తున్నది. కాబట్టి ప్రధానమంత్రిగారు ఇప్పటికైనా ప్రజలయోగ క్షేమం కోరేవారైతే యీ బిల్లును రద్దు చేయండి. బడ్జటు లోటును మరొక విధంగా పూర్తి చేయండి అప్పుడే ప్రజలక్షేమం చూచినవారు కాగలరు. ప్రజా నీకానికి యీ బిల్లులో సూచించిన పన్ను అసంభవము అని ముఖ్యమంత్రిగారు జ్ఞాపకము వుంచుకోవాలని కోరుతున్నాను.”

SRI T. LAKSHMINARAYANA REDDI:—“ On a point of order, Sir, the Hon. Chief Minister has said that the Peace Movement is a Communist movement. Dr. Atal . . . ”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ It is no point of order at all. Mr. Ramamurthi has taken my permission to reply to that point raised by the Hon. Chief Minister. I call upon Mr. S. Deivasigamany to speak now.”

SRI T. LAKSHMINARAYANA REDDI:—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, . . . ”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ It is no point of order at all and I am not going to allow the hon. Member to speak.”

[5th December 1952]

SRI S. DEIVASIGAMANY :—“ Sir, I do not want to make a speech. I just want to know whether we are to understand from the speech of the Hon. Chief Minister that the bus passenger fares would not be increased by the bus-owners? If they increase, will they be penalised? ”

SRI R. SIDDANNA GOWD :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, the time chosen for bringing this taxation measure is most inopportune and ill-suited. The country is passing through an economic crisis. There is depression in trade, depression in agriculture, depression in labour and there is depression all round. Famine and pestilence are rampant in the country. No worse period could have been chosen by the Government for bringing new taxation measures like this. The Hon. Chief Minister has struck a conciliatory note in the speech which he made just now and while doing so has attributed motives to the Opposition including the K.M.P. Party which I have the honour to represent. There is no opposition to taxation measures for the sake of mere opposition. If the K.M.P. Party was convinced about the reasonableness of fresh taxation measures, it would have heartily supported the Government in sponsoring those measures. That Party feels that the present time is most inopportune for bringing this measure. Lately I have had the opportunity of travelling over an extensive area in the Mysore and Madras States, and I found that almost 50 per cent of the buses were plying with 50 per cent of the seats filled up or vacant. Bus operators also are passing through an economic depression. Most of the routes are uneconomic and therefore they are not in a position to bear this heavy taxation. The incidence of taxation must always depend upon the capacity of the assessee to bear it. However fabulous might have been the income of the bus operators in the past, they are not in a position to bear this extra taxation at present. The Hon. Chief Minister says that it is not the passengers that are taxed. When bus operators are taxed, they naturally pass on the burden to the passengers by increasing the fares. Are the Government going to prohibit them from raising the fares? If they are prepared to do that, the Opposition may reconsider and decide whether to support the measure or not. But the Government do not want to prohibit the raising of fares. In the original Bill, goods traffic was not included, but even that is brought within the purview of the present Bill.

“ Much is made of the exemption provided for stage carriages, the total permitted daily mileage of which does not exceed fifty miles. There are very few stage carriages which ply for a distance of fifty miles or less per day. It is only an eye-wash to say that small operators are exempted from this tax. The Hon. Chief Minister said that there was a deficit in the budget and that this taxation measure was brought forward to balance the budget.

6-20
p.m.

“ Secondly, the Hon. Minister says that there is an agitation on all sides, not only outside this House but also inside it, that roads should be improved, that bridges and culverts should be constructed, that new roads should be laid, that schemes for extension

5th December 1952] [Sri R. Siddanna Gowd]

of electricity should be undertaken, and that all other ameliorative measures should be undertaken by the Government. It is true that the Opposition Members and other Members in this House and the people outside are agitating for ameliorative measures to be undertaken by the Government. The Government must first adopt retrenchment measures. There are numerous superfluous and supernumerary Government posts in the State. The party in power, when it was in the Opposition, wanted to abolish most of these supernumerary and superfluous posts. It used to call most of these posts as veritable fifth wheel of the coach. But the Congress Party has come into power recently and has changed its views and is opposed to the retrenchment proposals put forward by the Opposition Party. If the Government had effected retrenchment in accordance with the wishes of the Opposition and abolished supernumerary and superfluous posts, and if even then they found that they were not able to balance the Budget, then the Opposition would have been prepared to extend its hand of co-operation to passing measures of fresh taxation. But they have done none of these things. With what face are they appealing to the Opposition, in the name of equity and justice, to accept these measures of fresh taxation?

“Further, the Opposition is treated with scant courtesy and almost all popular measures and democratic suggestions from the side of the Opposition are flouted. The House is aware that the Hon. the Minister for Local Administration, in replying to certain questions, refused to adopt the system of secret voting in the case of elections to panchayats, disregarding the views expressed both by the people outside and the Members of the Opposition Party. Then, with what face are the Government asking us to co-operate in passing this taxation measure? Moreover, in the municipal elections most horrible corrupt practices have been followed. Even dead persons have come to life and persons residing fifty or sixty miles away from the municipal limits have been impersonated, and false voting has freely taken place. If the method of marking with indelible ink which was adopted in respect of elections to the Legislative Assembly had been adopted in the case of municipal elections also, many of these corrupt practices could have been prevented.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Let the hon. Member come to the point.”

SRI R. SIDDANNA GOWD :—“ A number of cases in the Anantapur district itself, of which I am aware, have been taken to the Court and it has been proved that corrupt practices were followed.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Let the hon. Member come to the point.”

SRI R. SIDDANNA GOWD :—“ I am coming to the point, Sir. With regard to the conciliatory note struck by the Hon. the Chief Minister, I am obliged to place this point before the House.

[Sri R. Siddanna Gowd] [5th December 1952]

If the Government are really sincere in their appeal to the Opposition, the Opposition would have no hesitation to extend its co-operation to them. But the present measure is inequitous and is unsuited to the times. The bus operators in the country are not in a position to bear the burden of this extra taxation. So, I oppose this Bill."

* SRI K. R. SAMBANDAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, while supporting the amendments, I would like to say a few words on this Bill. After the War, the prices have gone up and the bus-owners and lorry-owners are not in a position to conduct their business profitably. Many of the bus-owners are in bankruptcy and they are put to a lot of difficulties. So, they are not in a position now to bear the burden of this tax. If the incidence of taxation falls upon the passengers, they are also not in a position to bear it because the existing rate of fare is very high and if it is further increased, it will not be possible for them to pay it.

" Then the Government say that their financial condition is very poor and that it must be improved. There are many methods of improving it. Firstly, instead of taxing the bus operators, the Government can very well tax private car-owners. During the current year about 10,000 cars have been sold. In view of this, the quarterly tax on cars can be doubled. Since the private owners have more than one car each, they will not find it difficult to pay the enhanced tax. Secondly, the Government can collect taxes from the unauthorized taxis plying in cities and towns like Madras, Tanjore, Mayuram, Tiruchirappalli, Coimbatore and Madurai. In all these places, there are many taxis which are not paying taxes. If proper checking is instituted, taxes can be collected from these unauthorized taxis also. Thirdly, if we scrap Prohibition, there will be no necessity for additional taxation. We are not only losing money but also spending a lot of money on account of Prohibition, which we are continuing for the sake of prestige. There is no use of standing on prestige. If we want to administer the country properly and efficiently, we must give up Prohibition. If we do that, we can get enough money for administration. So, I oppose the Bill."

* SRI M. VENUGOPALA GOUNDER :—"கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே! தற்பொழுது தொழில் மந்திரி அவர்கள் கொண்டு வந்திருக்கும் இந்த பஸ் சர்சார்ஜ் வரியானது மிகவும் அதிகமென்று பலர் பேசிவிட்டார்கள். நானும் அந்த வரியானது தற்பொழுது போடாக்கூடாதென்பதையே ஆதரித்துச் சில வார்த்தைகள் பேச விரும்புகிறேன். யுத்தத்திற்குப் பிறகு இந்த பஸ், லாரி தொழிலானது எவ்வளவு மோசமான நிலைமையில் இருக்கிறதென்பதை பஸ்களை நடத்துகிறவர்களிடம் கேட்டால் நன்கு தெரியும். ஆனால் இந்த மாகாணத்தில் ஒரேகேள் ஆயிரத்து இருநூறு லாரிகளில் ஒரு லாரி கூட நல்ல நிலைமையில் இல்லையென்பது என்னுடைய அபிப்பிராயம். அதற்குப் பல காரணங்கள் இருக்கின்றன. 1947-ம் வருஷத்திற்குப் பிறகு எல்லா 'ஸ்பேர் பார்ட்ஸ்' விலைகளும் ஏறியிருக்கின்றன. ஒன்றுக்கு நாலு மடங்கு அதிக விலை இன்றைய தினம் விற்கப்படுவது உங்கள் எல்லோருக்கும் தெரியும். ஆகையினால்தான் இப்பொழுது மிகவும் மோசமான நிலைமையில் இருந்து கொண்டிருக்கிற பஸ் முதலாளிகளின்மேல் மேலும் வரிபோட முயற்சிப்பது சரியல்ல. எல்லா இடத்தையும் விட இந்த

5th December 1952] [Sri M. Venugopala Gounder]

ராஜ்யத்தில்தான் பஸ்கள்மீது மிக அதிகமான வரி போடப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. ஆகையினால் இன்னும் மேலும் மேலும் வரிபோட முயற்சிப்பது சரியாகாது. இந்த மாகாணத்தில் மிகவும் குறைந்த பஸ் முதலாளிகள்தான் இருக்கிறார்கள். ஆகையால் சர்க்கார் அவர்களுடைய நிலைமை எவ்வளவு கேவலமான நிலையில் இன்றையதினம் இருக்கிறதென்பதை அறிய வேண்டுமானாலும் அந்தது கொள்ளலாம். ஒவ்வொரு பஸ் முதலாளியுடைய ஸ்டாபிளிகேட்டுகளை வாங்கிப்பார்த்தால் ஒவ்வொரு ஸ்டாபிளிகேட்டுகளும் ஹயர் பர்சேஸ் அக்டரிமெண்டில்தான் இருக்கும். இப்படி அந்தத் தொழிலில் மிகவும் கஷ்டங்கள் இருக்கும்பொழுது மேலும் மேலும் சர்சார்ஜ் போடுவதானது அந்தத் தொழிலை நசுக்கும்படி செய்வதாகும் என்பதுதான் என் அபிப்பிராயம். மேலும் போக்குவரத்துச் சாதனங்கள் இப்பொழுது அதிகமாகிக்கொண்டிருப்பதினால்தான் பல சிறு சிறு கிராமங்களில்லாம் இன்றையதினம் முன்னேற ஆரம்பித்திருக்கின்றன. இப்பொழுது வரியைப் போட்டு அந்தத் தொழிலை நசுக்கச் செய்தால் இன்னும் எவ்வளவு காலம் ஆனாலும் சிறு கிராமங்கள் முன்னேறவே வசதியில்லாமல்தான் போகும். 1942-ம் வருஷத்திலிருந்து இந்த பஸ்களுக்கு முன்று முறைகள் உபரி வரி போடப்பட்டிருக்கின்றன. சமீபத்தில் பம்பாய் மாகாணத்தில் சர்க்கார் பஸ் வரியை 12 ரூபாய்களிலிருந்து 17 ரூபாய்க்கு உயர்த்த உத்தேசித்தபோது பஸ் முதலாளிகளும், பொதுமக்களும் திரண்டு எதிர்த்ததன் காரணமாக அவர்கள் அதைக் கைவிட்டு விட்டார்கள் என்பதை நாம் மறக்கக்கூடாது. இந்த வரி மிகவும் அப்சியமற்றது. சர்க்காருக்கு பணம் வேண்டுமென்றால் பிற வழிகளைக் கையாள் வேண்டுமே தவிர இந்தத் தொழிலின்மீது மேலும் மேலும் வரிப் பளுவைச் சுமத்த முயலக்கூடாது. நகரத்தில் சர்க்கார் பஸ்கள் ஓடுகின்றன. அந்தக் கணக்கை வைத்துக்கொண்டு பஸ் தொழிலில் நிறைய லாபம் வருவதாகக் கணக்குப் பார்க்கக்கூடாது. இங்கு நல்ல தார் ரோடுகளும், சிமிண்டு ரோடுகளும் இருப்பதால் பஸ் லாரி போன்றவைகளுக்கு வேண்டிய சாமான்கள் அதிகமாகச் சேதம் ஆகிறது இல்லை. ஆனால் நகரத்தை அடுத்து ஓடுப பஸ்களுக்கு அப்படியில்லை. கரடு முரடான ரோடுகளிலும், மேடு பள்ளத்திலும் அவைகள் போகவேண்டியிருப்பதால் அடிக்கடி 6 மாதத்திற்குள் அதன் சாமான்களை மாற்றிக்கொண்டேயிருக்க வேண்டியிருக்கிறது. அவர்களுடைய இரண்டு வருஷ சராசரி கணக்கை எடுத்துப் பார்த்தார்களேயானால் அவர்களுக்கு எவ்வளவு கஷ்டம் ஏற்பட்டுக்கொண்டிருக்கிறதென்பது தெரியும். ஆகையால் இதையெல்லாம் உத்தேசித்து சர்க்கார் இந்த பஸ் முதலாளிகள் மீதும், லாரிகள் மீதும் சர்சார்ஜ் போடவேண்டிய விஷயத்தைக் கைவிடவேண்டும். பஸ் சர்சார்ஜ் போடுவதால் மக்களுக்கு என்ன நஷ்டம். இது முதலாளிகளைப் போய் தாக்குகிறதே தவிர பிரயாணிகளை எந்த வகையிலும் நஷ்டப்படுத்தாது என்று சொல்லலாம். இப்பொழுது ஆர்.டி.ஏ. பஸ்களுக்கு 7 காசு போட்டுக் கொள்ளலாமென்று சொல்லும்போது பல பஸ்துறையில் பஸ் முதலாளிகள் இன்றையதினம் 4½ காசுதான் வசூல் செய்துகொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். ஆகையால் இப்பொழுது 7 காசுகள் போட்டுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டுமே என்றாலும்கூட வரியை அதிகப்படுத்தினால் 4½ காசுகள் கொடுத்துக் கொண்டிருக்கும் பிரயாணிகளும்கூட நாளை 7 காசுகள் கொடுக்கவேண்டி வந்தால் அதனால் பிரயாணிகளுக்கு அனுகூலமா பிரதிகூலமா என்று பார்க்கவேண்டும். இவைகளையெல்லாம் பார்க்கும்பொழுது மிகச் சிறிய முதலாளிகள் பஸ் லாரி தொழிலில் கொள்ளை லாபம் அடித்துக்கொண்டு விடுவது போல எண்ணிக்கொண்டு மேலும் வரிபோட நினைப்பது மிகச் சிறிய நோக்கமாகும். இதைச் சர்க்கார் கைவிடவேண்டும். மக்களுக்கு சர்க்கார் நன்மை செய்ய வேண்டுமென்று எண்ணினால் முதன் முதலாக அவர்கள் பஸ், லாரிகள் மீது வரிபோடும் எண்ணத்தைக் கைவிடவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொண்டு என் பேச்சை முடித்துக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

* SRI G. NAGABHUSHANAM :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose all the amendments and support the Bill. On this side of the House, there are several hon. Members who are very eager to

6-30
P.m.

[Sri G. Nagabhushanam] [5th December 1952]

speak. But I am sorry to state that they are not given the same opportunity as is given to the hon. Members sitting on the opposite benches."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Sir, the hon. Member is making an allegation that Members on the side of the Government have not been given equal opportunities by the Chair as Members on this side of the House. I would like to know whether this allegation has got to be accepted."

MR. SPEAKER :—" All Members are given enough opportunities by me."

RAJA MUTHIAH CHETTIYAR OF CHETTINAD :—" Sir, I don't think the hon. Gentleman Mr. Ramamurthi is right in saying that Mr. Nagabhushanam is making an allegation. He only pleads with the Chair that more opportunities may be given to the Members on this side of the House."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I am giving equal opportunities to all the Members."

* SRI G. NAGABHUSHANAM :—" I am very sorry to find that hon. Member Mr. Ramamurthi has taken objection to my observation. Whenever any Member from this side of the House rose to speak, some of the hon. Members on the opposite side raised some objection or other and thus made it impossible for him to speak at all. (Laughter.) That is how the proceedings were going on. Especially, the Communist Members have taken full advantage of the freedom of speech guaranteed under our Constitution and are making use of it for propagating their ideals."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Let not the hon. Member make all these remarks. Let him confine himself to the subject before the House. The Chair has given equal opportunities to all."

* SRI G. NAGABHUSHANAM :—" Sir, some hon. Members oppose this Bill for opposition's sake. Most of the arguments advanced by them are revolutionary in character. They say that no compensation should be awarded to the zamindars. I would like to invite the attention of those hon. Members to Article 31 of the Constitution which deals with 'Right to property.' So, their suggestion to stop the payment of compensation to zamindars is revolutionary in character. They will not be satisfied with anything else except revolution. They are aiming at totalitarian rule. As they are having a revolutionary attitude, they will never be satisfied with any work of utility or public interest or with any Bill that may be brought forward by the Government. So they will oppose everything for opposition sake. On the one hand, hon. Members of the Opposition have been complaining that the Government have not done anything with regard to famine relief, hospitals, schools and colleges and any other beneficial work for society, but when the Government bring forward financial Bills to realise those objectives by undertaking useful works the Opposition Members deliberately oppose those Bills. In the

5th December 1952] [Sri G. Nagabhushanam]

manner I have stated above they have been blowing hot and cold. How can any Government undertake those beneficial measures without money? How are they to get the money? Naturally, they must collect the money from the people. But the Members of the Opposition say that this should not be done, and at the same time they want the Government to carry on the administration efficiently and to undertake all those beneficial measures, such as improvement of hospitals, famine relief works, etc. Take the case of the Rayalaseema. For providing effective relief to that part of the State, the Government need a lot of money. Some of the hon. Members sitting on the opposite side have been telling that the Government have done nothing in Anantapur district so far as famine relief is concerned. How can the Government do anything effectively without money? They say that no money should be sent to Great Britain by way of pension to retired I.C.S. officers. They must remember that we have under certain contractual obligations to Great Britain and so we cannot stop sending this money. Those officers, who have served India, and have gone home, under law, are bound to get their money for the services rendered in India. The suggestion not to pay is revolutionary and is quite opposed to the Constitution. Therefore, I say before this Honourable House that all their proposals are destructive and revolutionary and prevent the Government from functioning efficiently and bring about chaos.

“As regards the provisions of this Bill, they are very moderate. At the present time, we are in need of money. Though it may be stated that there is slump in the industry, I feel since tax on motor vehicles being moderate, the Bill has to be taken up. Till recently the hon. Members on the opposite were urging on the Chief Minister, Sri Rajagopalachari, to introduce this Bill in the House, saying that the bus-owners were making a good deal of money. Some of them even suggested that the routes should be auctioned as some of the bus-owners were making huge profits. When the present Bill is brought forward, the same Members who wanted such a measure, are opposing it now. With these few words, I support the Bill, which is a very moderate one.”

6-40
p.m.

* SRI PRAGADA KOTAIAH :—“Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Bill before the House. The reason, why I support it, is the bus operators and the lorry owners have been making much money during all these years. It is they who are going to be taxed and not the people as some Members suggested. Taxation of motor vehicles that carry passengers and goods is really a matter in which there cannot be any two opinions because nowadays, the traffic by motor vehicles has increased to such an extent that the responsibility of the Government has multiplied in different directions, namely, laying and maintaining motorable roads, taking measures for prevention of accidents, and enforcement of regulations from time to time, that are found necessary for the comfortable journey of the passengers and for the safe carrying of goods by lorries. But the Bill requires certain small modifications to provide relief from the taxation to small operators, including the

[Sri Pragada Kotaiah] [5th December 1952]

co-operative societies in the State. I suggest that the co-operative societies formed exclusively for the benefit of the ex-servicemen in the State and also one or two co-operative societies started by civilians and engaged in operating bus services should be exempted from the scope of the Bill. There are about 800 members in those co-operative societies running lorry and bus services. About 270 lorries and about 20 to 30 buses only are owned by co-operative societies. So by exempting them, there will not be much reduction in the revenue and practically there will be no effect at all by such reduction on the revenues of the State.

" Then, Sir, there are small operators owning one or two buses. The incidence of taxation under the provisions of the Bill will be very heavy for the small operators. Therefore, the Government should introduce certain modifications to exempt the small owners, owning one or two buses, from the provisions of this Bill. I think, however, that that may ultimately lead to malpractices on the part of the big operators. Once the small operators is exempted from the tax, the big operators having more number of buses and lorries will seriously attempt to transfer the ownership of their vehicles to other people at the rate of one per each and ultimately evade the payment of the tax. Therefore, the Government should introduce a different scale of taxation for the small operators.

" Sir, with regard to the submission of returns, it is made compulsory on the part of the operators to submit returns daily. I think it will be difficult particularly for lorry owners to submit returns daily. Therefore, caution should be taken to see that minimum difficulty is experienced by the operators in this respect.

" The Government should instruct the prescribed officers in the Bill to see that no harassment is caused to the bus operators and lorry owners in the performance of their duties.

" Sir, it is a matter of surprise to me that some hon. Members are sympathizing with the condition of the bus owners and lorry owners. Till yesterday, they made speeches that the bus owners and lorry owners have been making much money and that they should be heavily taxed. But now they have turned round and are pleading on behalf of the owners, who are still making much money. Certain Members have also suggested that the tax will ultimately fall on the people who are travelling in buses. Sir, it is not like that because the maximum scale of bus fare has been fixed under the Act of 1939 and particularly in the Andhra districts, almost all the buses are already collecting seven pies per mile per head and at times even blackmarket fares. Therefore, the incidence of taxation under the circumstances does not fall upon the passengers but directly upon the operators. There is no justification in opposing this Bill on that ground. We must also find means to secure adequate finances for the State to enable it to meet increasing demands from the people for more amenities, particularly, of the backward sections of the community.

5th December 1952] [Sri Pragada Kotaiah]

“ Therefore, Sir, I want the co-operative societies to be exempted and some relief to be shown to small operators of buses and lorries. With these reservations, I support the Bill before the House.”

* DR. K. B. MENON :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Hon. the Chief Minister has hurled very serious charges against the Opposition. But I am sure the Communists are capable of taking care of themselves and I shall not, therefore, enter into a discussion on that. But I wish to assure him that the Opposition is not interested in opposing taxation measures as such. The Opposition has a right to know who is taxed, how the tax is collected and how it is spent. The trouble is that the Chief Minister, with his razor-blade mind—his gift of the gab, if I may use a slang expression—and with his irresistible logic is able to convince people against their own convictions. He is right when he says that there is a financial stringency facing us now. We accept it. But he did not remember that when he stuck to his pet scheme of Prohibition, when the Opposition demanded that a Committee be appointed to go into the question. I am not entirely for scrapping Prohibition.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ When the time comes, the hon. Member will see the Chief Minister giving up Prohibition without a committee.” (Laughter.)

* DR. K. B. MENON :—“ When he gives it up, then there will be no financial stringency.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ There will be no finance in it even if I abolish Prohibition to-day.” 6-50 p.m.

DR. K. B. MENON :—“ When he gives it up, then there will theories and living as he does in a glass house, he should not throw stones on others. The Opposition has pet theories about taxation and if they stick to it he should be liberal to allow them to express their views on the subject.

“ As I said, Sir, we are not opposed to taxation as such. The first attempt of the Government was to impose a tax, a surcharge of one pie per passenger per mile. There was such a howl inside and outside this Assembly and then it was referred to the Select Committee. It came out of the Select Committee so mauled out of shape that the Government now are producing it as a separate Bill. My objection is not to the tax but to the way in which the tax is imposed and on whom it is proposed to be imposed. We are against taxing the poor passenger. This was accepted by the Government. They gave us a surprise at the Select Committee when they agreed to tax the bus-owner. The Socialist party did not oppose that. The Socialist party does not oppose it even to-day. What we are opposed to is, in the first place, we feel there is no necessity for taxation. Bus-owners who gave evidence, every one of them, agreed it was not necessary to impose fresh taxes if only the Government took care to collect the existing impositions. By that the Government would be able to make more

[Dr. K. B. Menon] [5th December 1952]

than the deficit with which they are face now, namely, 2 to 3 crores. It would be easy, for the Government to collect three crores of rupees. I think in the Committee, no one representing the Government side seriously objected to the contention of the bus-owners and they seemed to accept it, for they immediately shifted the burden of the tax on to the bus-owner. We feel, and we definitely got the impression sitting in the Select Committee, that it is possible to get two to three crores of rupees if the Government were strict in the collection of taxes that are already there.

“ My next point is that it is a very sound canon of taxation that the amount collected by taxing a particular section of society, at least a large share of the income from that tax, should go to the benefit of that sector. Both the Central and the State Governments are guilty of violating that sound canon of taxation. They are having certain departments such as the Transport, the Railways, the Post-office. In this State the bus transport is a paying proposition and they do not mind imposing fresh taxation. But the Government take it to the General Revenues to make up deficits. We have no objection to the tax being collected from the bus-owners. But that tax, a large portion of the income from that tax at least, must be diverted to improve the system of transport in the State. So long as that is not done, I think there is no justification in imposing fresh taxation. That is what I have to say about this taxation measure.

“ Now regarding the Bill as presented, I have certain objections. In the first place, ‘ the prescribed officer ’, I think that is the word used in the Bill, is vested with unusual powers. It is dangerous to do that. To vest the executive with such responsibilities in itself is a very risky thing. Especially when it happens that the ‘ prescribed officer ’ is an ordinary official, the chances of abuse are greater. Also, Sir, in the case of buses, the question of the role of police officers has been a very, very debated question. Even to-day the police alone has the right to charge overload and if the police officer, whether he is a sub-inspector or a head constable, has to travel, the bus will wait before the police station for an hour or half an hour in order to pick him up. If he is assured of the first seat in the bus from the start any amount of overload is allowed. This kind of tyranny by the police ought to be checked. There are no provisions in the Bill to prevent it. I do not know what suggestions to offer in this respect. I suppose in the course of the debate some suggestions may be made. These are some of the objections we have to the Bill and some kind of solution ought to be found .”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I thought I would be called tomorrow. With only five minutes more, I thought I won't be called and so I packed up all my papers and sent them away.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Then the hon. Member can speak tomorrow. The House will now adjourn and meet again at 2 p.m. tomorrow.”

The House then adjourned.